



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

September 9, 1993

Docket No. 50-333

Mr. Ralph E. Beedle
Executive Vice President - Nuclear Generation
Power Authority of the State of New York
123 Main Street
White Plains, New York 10601

Dear Mr. Beedle:

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT FOR JAMES A. FITZPATRICK NUCLEAR POWER PLANT
(TAC NO. M86942)

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 197 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-59 for the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant. The amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) in response to your application transmitted by letter dated June 30, 1993.

The amendment makes four changes to the TSs. The first change revises TS 3.7.A. and associated Bases to specify minimum and maximum water levels in the torus in terms of elevation above the bottom of the torus rather than in terms of depth of vent submergence. The second change revises TS 4.7.A. and associated Bases to require torus inspections during each operating cycle rather than during each refueling outage. This change permits torus inspections to be conducted during mid-cycle outages as well as during refueling outages. The third change also revises TS 4.7.A. and associated Bases to clarify the responsibility of the operator to observe suppression pool temperature and to require operator logging of suppression pool temperature when continuous recording is not available. The fourth change corrects editorial errors and clarifies terminology in TSs 3.7.A., 4.7.A., and associated Bases.

150057

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

9309170042 930909
PDR ADOCK 05000333
P PDR

DF01

Mr. Ralph E. Beedle

- 2 -

September 9, 1993

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

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

John E. Menning, Project Manager
Project Directorate I-1
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:

- 1. Amendment No. 197 to DPR-59
- 2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

Distribution:

See attached sheet

*See previous concurrence

LA:PDI-1	PM:PDI-1 <i>ADB</i>	PM:PDI-1	ECGB <i>[Signature]</i>	EMEB <i>MCB</i>	SCSB*
CVogan <i>w</i>	DBrinkman: <i>smm</i>	JMenning <i>Jm</i>	BBagchi	JNorberg <i>[Signature]</i>	RBarrett
8/23/93	8/23/93	8/23/93	8/23/93	8/26/93	08/26/93
OGC	D:PDI-1				
<i>[Signature]</i>	RACapra <i>rw</i>				
8/30/93	9/9/93				

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY
FILENAME: FIT86942.AMD


Mr. Ralph E. Beedle

- 2 -

September 9, 1993

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

Sincerely,



John E. Menning, Project Manager
Project Directorate I-1
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 197 to DPR-59
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

Mr. Ralph E. Beedle
Power Authority of the State of New York

James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear
Power Plant

cc:

Mr. Gerald C. Goldstein
Assistant General Counsel
Power Authority of the State
of New York
1633 Broadway
New York, New York 10019

Regional Administrator, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

Resident Inspector's Office
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Post Office Box 136
Lycoming, New York 13093

Ms. Donna Ross
New York State Energy Office
2 Empire State Plaza
16th Floor
Albany, New York 12223

Mr. Harry P. Salmon, Jr.
Resident Manager
James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear
Power Plant
Post Office Box 41
Lycoming, New York 13093

Mr. J. A. Gray, Jr.
Director Nuclear Licensing - BWR
Power Authority of the State
of New York
123 Main Street
White Plains, New York 10601

Supervisor
Town of Scriba
Route 8, Box 382
Oswego, New York 13126

Mr. Robert G. Schoenberger
Acting President
Power Authority of the State
of New York
123 Main Street
White Plains, New York 10601

Charles Donaldson, Esquire
Assistant Attorney General
New York Department of Law
120 Broadway
New York, New York 10271

DATED: September 9, 1993

AMENDMENT NO. 197 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-59-FITZPATRICK

Docket File
NRC & Local PDRs
PDI-1 Reading
S. Varga, 14/E/4
J. Calvo, 14/A/4
R. Capra
C. Vogan
J. Menning
OGC
D. Hagan, 3302 MNBB
G. Hill (2), P1-22
C. Grimes, 11/F/23
D. Brinkman
ACRS (10)
OPA
OC/LFDCB
PD plant-specific file
C. Cowgill, Region I
R. Barrett, 8/H/7
G. Bagchi, 7/H/15
J. Norberg, 7/E/23

cc: Plant Service list



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

DOCKET NO. 50-333

JAMES A. FITZPATRICK NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 197
License No. DPR-59

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment by Power Authority of the State of New York (the licensee) dated June 30, 1993, 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-59 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 197, 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 to be implemented within 30 days.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Robert A. Capra, Director
Project Directorate I-1
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: September 9, 1993

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 197

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-59

DOCKET NO. 50-333

Revise Appendix A as follows:

Remove Pages

165
188
188a

Insert Pages

165
188
188a

JAFNPP

3.7 LIMITING CONDITIONS FOR OPERATION

3.7 CONTAINMENT SYSTEMS

Applicability:

Applies to the operating status of the primary and secondary containment systems.

Objective:

To assure the integrity of the primary and secondary containment systems.

Specification:

A. Primary Containment

1. The level from the bottom of the torus and temperature of the water in the torus shall be maintained within the following limits whenever the reactor is critical or whenever the reactor coolant temperature is greater than 212°F and irradiated fuel is in the reactor vessel:

- a. Maximum level of 14.00 feet.
- b. Minimum level of 13.88 feet.

The torus water level may be outside the above limits for a maximum of four (4) hours as a result of required operability testing of HPCI, RCIC, RHR, CS, and the Drywell - Torus Vacuum Relief System.

- c. Maximum water temperature
 - (1) During normal power operation maximum water temperature shall be 95°F.

4.7 SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.7 CONTAINMENT SYSTEMS

Applicability:

Applies to the primary and secondary containment integrity.

Objective:

To verify the integrity of the primary and secondary containment systems.

Specification:

A. Primary Containment

1. The torus water level and temperature shall be monitored as specified in Table 4.2-8.

The accessible interior surfaces of the drywell and above the water line of the torus shall be inspected each operating cycle for evidence of deterioration.

Whenever there is indication of relief valve operation or testing which adds heat to the suppression pool, the pool temperature shall be continuously recorded until the heat addition is terminated. The operator will verify that average temperature is within applicable limits every 5 minutes. In lieu of continuous recording, the operator shall log the temperature every 5 minutes.

Whenever there is indication of relief valve operation with the temperature of the suppression pool reaching 160°F or more and the primary coolant system pressure greater than 200 psig, an external visual examination of the torus shall be conducted before resuming power operation.

3.7 BASES (cont'd)

Using the minimum or maximum torus water level (which are based on downcomer submergence levels where 13.88 feet above the bottom of the torus is 0.005 feet higher than the minimum submergence of 51.5 inches and 14.00 feet above the bottom of the torus is equivalent to the maximum submergence of 53 inches assumed in containment analyses) containment pressure during the design basis accident is approximately 45 psig which is below the design of 56 psig. The minimum downcomer submergence of 51.5 inches results in a minimum torus water volume of approximately 105,600 feet³. The majority of the Bodega tests (9) were run with a submerged length of 4 feet and with complete condensation. Thus, with respect to downcomer submergence, this specification is adequate. Additional JAFNPP specific analyses done in connection with the Mark I Containment-Suppression Chamber Integrity Program indicate the adequacy of the specified range of submergence to ensure that dynamic forces associated with pool swell do not result in overstress of the torus or associated structures. Level instrumentation is provided for operator use to maintain downcomer submergence within the specified range.

The maximum temperature at the end of blowdown tested during the Humboldt Bay (10) and Bodega Bay tests was 170°F, and this is conservatively taken to be the limit for complete condensation of the limit for complete condensation of the reactor coolant, although condensation would occur for temperatures above 170°F.

Using a 40°F rise (Section 5.2 FSAR) in the torus water temperature and a maximum initial temperature of 95°F, a temperature of 145°F is achieved, which is well below the 170°F temperature which is used for complete condensation.

For an initial maximum torus water temperature of 95°F and assuming the normal complement of containment cooling pumps (two LPCI pumps and two RHR service water pumps) containment pressure is not required to maintain adequate net positive suction head (HPSH) for the core spray LPCI and HPCI pumps.

Limiting suppression pool temperature to 130°F during RCIC, HPCI, or relief valve operation, when decay heat and stored energy are removed from the primary system by discharging reactor steam directly to the torus assures adequate margin for a potential blowdown any time during RCIC, HPCI, or relief valve operation.

Experimental data indicates that excessive steam condensing loads can be avoided if the peak temperature of the suppression pool is maintained below 160°F during any period of relief valve operation with sonic conditions at the discharge exit. Specifications have been placed on the envelope of reactor operating conditions so that the reactor can be depressurized in a timely manner to avoid the regime of potentially high torus loadings.

JAFNPP

3.7 BASES (Cont'd)

In addition to the limits on temperature of the suppression pool water, operating procedures define the action to be taken in the event a relief valve inadvertently opens or sticks open. These procedures include: (1) use of all available means to close the valve, (2) initiate suppression pool cooling, (3) initiate reactor shutdown, and (4) if other relief valves are used to depressurize the reactor, their discharge shall be separated from that of the stuck-open relief valve to assure mixing and uniformity of energy insertion to the pool.

Because of the large volume and thermal capacity of the suppression pool, the volume and temperature normally changes very slowly and monitoring these parameters daily is sufficient to establish any temperature trends. By requiring the suppression pool temperature to be verified as within applicable limits every 5 minutes as well as continuously recorded (the operator can log temperature during verification if continuous recording is not available) during periods of significant heat addition, the temperature trends will be closely followed so that appropriate action can be taken. There are alarms at applicable limits to provide further assurance of appropriate action. The requirement for an external visual examination following any event where potentially high loadings could occur provides assurance that no significant damage was encountered. Particular attention should be focused on structural discontinuities in the vicinity of the relief valve discharge since these are expected to be the points of highest stress.

If a loss-of-coolant accident were to occur when the reactor water temperature is below 330°F, the containment pressure will not exceed the 56 psig design pressure, even if no condensation were to occur. The maximum allowable pool temperature, whenever the reactor is above 212°F, shall be governed by this



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 197 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-59
POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
JAMES A. FITZPATRICK NUCLEAR POWER PLANT
DOCKET NO. 50-333

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated June 30, 1993, the Power Authority of the State of New York (the licensee) submitted a request for changes to the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant, Technical Specifications (TS). The requested changes would revise TS 3.7.A. and associated Bases to specify minimum and maximum water levels in the torus in terms of elevation above the bottom of the torus rather than in terms of depth of vent submergence. The second change would revise TS 4.7.A. and associated Bases to require torus inspections during each operating cycle rather than during each refueling outage. This change permits torus inspections to be conducted during mid-cycle outages as well as during refueling outages. The third change would also revise TS 4.7.A. and associated Bases to clarify the responsibility of the operator to observe suppression pool temperature and to require operator logging of suppression pool temperature when continuous recording is not available. The fourth change would correct editorial errors and clarify terminology in TSs 3.7.A., 4.7.A., and associated Bases.

2.0 EVALUATION

TS 3.7.A. currently requires vent submergence of between 50 inches and 51.5 inches. The first proposed change would change the specified limits to maximum and minimum levels of between 14.00 feet and 13.88 feet from the bottom of the torus. The instruments provided for control room readout of torus water level indicate water level relative to the bottom of the torus; the proposed change would make the TS limits consistent with these readouts. Specifying the water level limits in the same units as those displayed in the control room readouts is good human engineering practice. Except for a small (0.005 feet) conservative adjustment to reflect instrument accuracy, the water levels specified in the proposed change are equivalent to those in the current TS. Therefore, this proposed change is acceptable.

TS 4.7.A. currently requires an inspection for evidence of deterioration of the accessible interior surfaces of the drywell and above the water line of the torus at each refueling outage. The second proposed change would require this inspection to be performed each operating cycle which will maintain the same inspection interval (nominally once per 18 months which is the length of

the typical fuel cycle). Permission to perform this inspection during mid-cycle outages may also reduce occupational exposure. Therefore, we find this proposed change acceptable.

Currently, TS 4.7.A. also requires that during heat addition to the suppression pool the pool temperature be "continually monitored and also observed and logged every 5 minutes until the heat addition is terminated." The third proposed change would require that the pool be "continuously recorded until the heat addition is terminated." The proposed change would also require the operator to verify that the average temperature of the pool is within applicable limits every 5 minutes and would permit the operator to log the temperature every 5 minutes in lieu of using a continuous recorder. We have concluded that this proposed change will provide adequate monitoring of the suppression pool average water temperature to ensure that appropriate actions will be taken if required. Therefore, we find the proposed change acceptable.

The proposed editorial changes are purely administrative changes that do not change any limits and are, therefore, acceptable.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the New York State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment changes a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes surveillance requirements. The NRC 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 the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (58 FR 41512). 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.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission 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, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor:
Donald S. Brinkman

Date: September 9, 1993