February 13, 2007

Mr. Michael R. Kansler
President
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
440 Hamilton Avenue
White Plains, NY 10601

SUBJECT: INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3 - ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS RE: STEAM GENERATOR TUBE INTEGRITY TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION BASED ON TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION TASK FORCE (TSTF) DOCUMENT TSTF-449, "STEAM GENERATOR TUBE INTEGRITY" (TAC NOS. MD0083, MD0084, MD2178, AND MD2179)

Dear Mr. Kansler:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 251 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-26 for the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2 and Amendment No. 233 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-64 for the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 3. The amendments consist of changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) in response to your application dated May 31, 2006, as supplemented by letter dated August 30, 2006.

The amendments revise the TSs associated with steam generator (SG) tube integrity consistent with Revision 4 to TSTF Standard Technical Specification Change Document TSTF-449, "Steam Generator Tube Integrity." A notice of availability for this TS improvement using the consolidated line item improvement process was published in the *Federal Register* on May 6, 2005 (70 FR 24126). As stated in your letter dated February 21, 2006, these amendments are also the modification of the SG portion of the TSs requested in NRC Generic Letter (GL) 2006-01, "Steam Generator Tube Integrity and Associated Technical Specifications." The NRC staff considers these amendments to be an acceptable and complete response to GL 2006-01. This completes the NRC staff's efforts on TAC Nos. MD0083, MD0084, MD2178, and MD2179.

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,

/RA/

John P. Boska, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch I-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-247 and 50-286

Enclosures:
1. Amendment No. 251 to DPR-26
2. Amendment No. 233 to DPR-64
3. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

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,

/RA/

John P. Boska, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch I-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-247 and 50-286

Enclosures:
1. Amendment No. 251 to DPR-26
2. Amendment No. 233 to DPR-64
3. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

Amendment No.: ML063450312
Package No.: ML063450333 *See safety evaluation dated September 28, 2006

OFFICE	LPL1-1/PM	LPL1-1/LA	ITSB/BC	DCI	OGC	LPL1-1/BC(A)
NAME	JBoska	SLittle	TKobetz*	KKarwoski	DRoth	DPickett
DATE	1/31/07	1/31/07	9/28/06	2/02/07	2/08/07	2/13/07

Official Record Copy

DATED: February 13, 2007

AMENDMENT NO. 251 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-26 INDIAN POINT UNIT 2 AND AMENDMENT NO. 233 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-64 INDIAN POINT UNIT 3

PUBLIC
LPL1-1 R/F
RidsNrrDorlLpla
RidsNrrDirsItsb
RidsNrrPMJBoska
RidsNrrLASLittle
ECobey, RI
GHill (4)
RidsOGCMailCenter
RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter
RidsNrrDirsItsb
KKarwoski
TWertz

cc: Plant Mailing list

Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 2 & 3

cc:

Mr. Gary J. Taylor
Chief Executive Officer
Entergy Operations, Inc.
1340 Echelon Parkway
Jackson, MS 39213

Mr. John T. Herron
Senior Vice President and
Chief Operating Officer
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
440 Hamilton Avenue
White Plains, NY 10601

Mr. Fred R. Dacimo
Site Vice President
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
Indian Point Energy Center
450 Broadway, GSB
P.O. Box 249
Buchanan, NY 10511-0249

Mr. Paul Rubin
General Manager, Plant Operations
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
Indian Point Energy Center
450 Broadway
P.O. Box 249
Buchanan, NY 10511-0249

Mr. Oscar Limpias
Vice President Engineering
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
440 Hamilton Avenue
White Plains, NY 10601

Mr. Christopher Schwarz
Vice President, Operations Support
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
440 Hamilton Avenue
White Plains, NY 10601

Mr. John F. McCann
Director, Licensing
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
440 Hamilton Avenue
White Plains, NY 10601

Ms. Charlene D. Faison
Manager, Licensing
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
440 Hamilton Avenue
White Plains, NY 10601

Mr. Michael J. Columb
Director of Oversight
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
440 Hamilton Avenue
White Plains, NY 10601

Mr. James Comiotes
Director, Nuclear Safety Assurance
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
Indian Point Energy Center
450 Broadway, GSB
P.O. Box 249
Buchanan, NY 10511-0249

Mr. Patric Conroy
Manager, Licensing
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
Indian Point Energy Center
450 Broadway, GSB
P. O. Box 249
Buchanan, NY 10511-0249

Assistant General Counsel
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
440 Hamilton Avenue
White Plains, NY 10601

Mr. Peter R. Smith, President
New York State Energy, Research, and
Development Authority
17 Columbia Circle
Albany, NY 12203-6399

Mr. Paul Eddy
New York State Department
of Public Service
3 Empire State Plaza
Albany, NY 12223

Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 2 & 3

cc:

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

Senior Resident Inspector's Office
Indian Point 2
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P.O. Box 59
Buchanan, NY 10511

Senior Resident Inspector's Office
Indian Point 3
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P.O. Box 59
Buchanan, NY 10511

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

Mayor, Village of Buchanan
236 Tate Avenue
Buchanan, NY 10511

Mr. Raymond L. Albanese
Four County Coordinator
200 Bradhurst Avenue
Unit 4 Westchester County
Hawthorne, NY 10532

Mr. William DiProfio
PWR SRC Consultant
139 Depot Road
East Kingston, NH 03827

Mr. Garry Randolph
PWR SRC Consultant
1750 Ben Franklin Drive, 7E
Sarasota, FL 34236

Mr. William T. Russell
PWR SRC Consultant
400 Plantation Lane
Stevensville, MD 21666-3232

Mr. Jim Riccio
Greenpeace
702 H Street, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20001

Mr. Phillip Musegaas
Riverkeeper, Inc.
828 South Broadway
Tarrytown, NY 10591

Mr. Mark Jacobs
IPSEC
46 Highland Drive
Garrison, NY 10524

ENTERGY NUCLEAR INDIAN POINT 2, LLC

ENTERGY NUCLEAR OPERATIONS, INC.

DOCKET NO. 50-247

INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NO. 2

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 251
License No. DPR-26

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

   A. The application for amendment by Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (the licensee) dated May 31, 2006, as supplemented on August 30, 2006, 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:

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 251 are hereby incorporated in the license. ENO shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/RA/

Douglas V. Pickett, Acting Chief
Plant Licensing Branch I-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Changes to the License and
Technical Specifications

Date of Issuance: February 13, 2007

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 251

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-26

DOCKET NO. 50-247

Replace the following page of the License with the attached revised page. The revised page is identified by amendment number and contains marginal lines indicating the areas of change.

Remove Page	Insert Page
3	3

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with the attached revised pages. The revised pages are identified by amendment number and contain marginal lines indicating the areas of change.

Remove Pages	Insert Pages
i	i
ii	ii
iii	iii
iv	iv
1.1-3	1.1-3
3.4.13-1	3.4.13-1
3.4.13-2	3.4.13-2
----	3.4.17-1
----	3.4.17-2
5.5-6	5.5-6
5.5-7	5.5-7
5.5-8	5.5-8
5.5-16	---
5.5-17	---
5.6-4	5.6-4
5.6-5	5.6-5

ENTERGY NUCLEAR INDIAN POINT 3, LLC

ENTERGY NUCLEAR OPERATIONS, INC.

DOCKET NO. 50-286

INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NO. 3

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 233
License No. DPR-64

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

   A. The application for amendment by Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (the licensee) dated May 31, 2006, as supplemented on August 30, 2006, 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-64 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 233, are hereby incorporated in the license. ENO shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/RA/

Douglas V. Pickett, Acting Chief
Plant Licensing Branch I-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Changes to the License and
Technical Specifications

Date of Issuance: February 13, 2007

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 233

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-64

DOCKET NO. 50-286

Replace the following page of the License with the attached revised page. The revised page is identified by amendment number and contains marginal lines indicating the areas of change.

Remove Page	Insert Page
3	3

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with the attached revised pages. The revised pages are identified by amendment number and contain marginal lines indicating the areas of change.

Remove Pages	Insert Pages
i	i
ii	ii
iii	iii
iv	iv
v	---
1.1-4	1.1-4
3.4.13-1	3.4.13-1
3.4.13-2	3.4.13-2
----	3.4.17-1
----	3.4.17-2
5.0-13	5.0-13
5.0-14	5.0-14
5.0-15	5.0-15
5.0-16	---
5.0-17	---
5.0-18	---
5.0-19	---
5.0-36	5.0-36

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 251 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-64

AND AMENDMENT NO. 233 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-26

ENTERGY NUCLEAR OPERATIONS, INC.

INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3

DOCKET NOS. 50-247 AND 50-286

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By application dated May 31, 2006 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML061590405), as supplemented by letter dated August 30, 2006 (ADAMS Accession No. ML062560048), Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Entergy or the licensee), requested changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) for Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 2 and 3 (IP2 and IP3). The supplement dated August 30, 2006, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The proposed changes would revise the existing steam generator (SG) tube surveillance program. The changes are modeled after TS Task Force (TSTF) document TSTF-449, Revision 4, "Steam Generator Tube Integrity," and the model safety evaluation prepared by the NRC that was published in the *Federal Register* on March 2, 2005 (70 FR 10298) under the consolidated line item improvement process (CLIIP). The scope of the application includes changes to the definition of leakage, changes to the primary-to-secondary leakage requirements, changes to the SG tube surveillance program (SG tube integrity), and changes to the SG reporting requirements.

2.0 REGULATORY EVALUATION

The background, description, and applicability of the proposed changes associated with the SG tube integrity issue and the applicable regulatory requirements were included in the NRC staff's model safety evaluation (SE) published in the *Federal Register* on March 2, 2005 (70 FR 10298). The "Notice of Availability of Model Application Concerning Technical Specification; Improvement To Modify Requirements Regarding Steam Generator Tube Integrity; Using the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process," was published in the *Federal Register* on May 6, 2005 (70 FR 24126), which made the model SE available for licensees to reference.

3.0 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

In its May 31, 2006, application, and August 30, 2006, supplement, the licensee proposed changes to the TSs that are modeled after TSTF Standard Technical Specification Change Document, TSTF-449, "Steam Generator Tube Integrity." There were minor differences between TSTF-449 and the licensee's application. These included differences in the facility licensing basis (than that discussed in TSTF-449) and differences in TS numbering, since the licensee has a different TS numbering scheme than that assumed in TSTF-449.

With respect to the differences in the facility licensing basis, the differences did not invalidate the technical evaluation on TSTF-449; rather they resulted in the licensee having to slightly deviate from some of the modifications discussed in TSTF-449. For example, in the Bases section for SG Tube Integrity, TSTF-449 indicated that the accident analysis for a steam generator tube rupture assumed the contaminated secondary fluid was only briefly released to the atmosphere via safety valves and the majority is discharged to the main condenser. Since the licensee has a different licensing basis than the one described in the standard TSs (i.e., TSTF-449), they modified the TSTF-449 wording to reflect their existing licensing Bases. Another example is that the licensee has significantly more detail concerning their accident analyses in the Bases section on operational leakage than that assumed in TSTF-449. As a result, some of the changes to the Bases section in TSTF-449 were not applicable. Since these differences were minor in nature, they were consistent with the plant's licensing basis (the level of detail incorporated into the TS Bases), or they were consistent with the intent of TSTF-449, the NRC staff determined they were acceptable.

Similarly, since the differences in numbering of the TSs is administrative in nature and did not affect the technical adequacy of the submittal, the NRC staff determined they were acceptable.

The remainder of the application was consistent with, or more limiting than, TSTF-449 with one exception, as discussed below. In TSTF-449, the limit on normal operating primary-to-secondary leakage rate through any one SG was less than the leakage used in the safety analysis. However, for IP2, the normal operating primary-to-secondary leakage limit (150 gallons-per-day (gpd) per SG) is identical to the accident-induced primary-to-secondary leakage limit for design-basis accidents (DBAs) other than an SG tube rupture. Even though the normal operating primary-to-secondary leakage limit and the accident-induced leakage limit have a different technical basis, it is not uncommon that the two limits are the same (note, the normal operating primary-to-secondary leakage limit cannot be greater than the accident-induced leakage limit). The normal operating primary-to-secondary leakage limit is intended to limit the frequency of SG tube ruptures (i.e., it is an early indicator of a potential loss of the structural integrity of an SG tube); whereas the accident-induced leakage limit ensures that the dose consequences associated with this leakage are acceptable. The NRC staff evaluated the acceptability of this difference in leakage limits between TSTF-449 and the licensee's submittal. During a DBA, the leak rate may increase above what was present during normal operation. Therefore, it may be necessary to ensure that the operational leak rate is kept below its limit in order to meet the accident limit. An increase in leakage during a DBA can be a result of either: (1) the higher differential pressure between the primary coolant system and the secondary system associated with a DBA thus causing the leak rate from flaws that leak during normal operation to leak at higher rates; or (2) the higher stress loadings associated with a DBA causing a flaw that was not leaking during normal operation to leak during the DBA.

The licensee indicated that they would administratively limit the amount of primary-to-secondary leakage to 75 gpd. This administrative limit is intended to provide margin between the operating and accident induced leakage limit consistent with TSTF-449. The NRC staff notes that although there may be margin between these limits, the staff's approval of TSTF-449 (and this amendment) was not intended to ensure that satisfying the operating leakage limit would result in the accident induced leakage limit being met. Rather, the NRC staff reviewed the adequacy of the proposed TS criteria for operational and accident-induced leakage based on the technical basis associated with each limit. Namely, that the operating leakage limit is effective at limiting the frequency of tube ruptures and the accident induced leakage limit is consistent with the plant's design and licensing basis. Since the TS criteria on operational leakage at IP2 is consistent with TSTF-449 and the accident-induced leakage limit is consistent with the licensee's accident analysis, the NRC staff finds the licensee's proposed TS criteria on these values acceptable.

The proposed TS changes establish a programmatic, largely performance-based regulatory framework for ensuring SG tube integrity is maintained. The NRC staff finds that it addresses key shortcomings of the current framework by ensuring that SG programs are focused on accomplishing the overall objective of maintaining tube integrity. It incorporates performance criteria for evaluating tube integrity that the NRC staff finds consistent with the structural margins and the degree of leak tightness assumed in the current plant licensing basis. The NRC staff finds that maintaining these performance criteria provides reasonable assurance that the SGs can be operated safely without increase in risk.

The revised TSs will contain limited specific details concerning how the SG Program is to achieve the required objective of maintaining tube integrity; the intent being that the licensee will have the flexibility to determine the specific strategy for meeting this objective. The NRC staff finds that the revised TSs include sufficient regulatory constraints on the establishment and implementation of the SG Program such as to provide reasonable assurance that tube integrity will be maintained.

Failure to meet the performance criteria will be reportable pursuant to the requirements in 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73. The NRC reactor oversight process provides a process by which the NRC staff can verify that the licensee has identified any SG Program deficiencies that may have contributed to such an occurrence and that appropriate corrective actions have been implemented.

The licensee also requested changes to the table of contents to the TSs. These changes are administrative in nature and did not affect the technical adequacy of the submittal, therefore the NRC staff determined they were acceptable.

The NRC staff finds that the TS changes proposed by the licensee in its May 31, 2006, application and August 30, 2006, supplement conform to the requirements of 10 CFR 50.36 and establish a TS framework that will provide reasonable assurance that SG tube integrity is maintained without undue risk to public health and safety.

The licensee included in its application the revised TS Bases to be implemented with the TS change. The NRC staff finds that the TS Bases Control Program is the appropriate process for updating the affected TS Bases pages and has, therefore, not included the affected Bases pages with this amendment.

In summary, the NRC staff determined that the model SE is applicable to this review (with the exceptions as discussed above) and finds the proposed changes acceptable.

4.0 STATE CONSULTATION

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

5.0 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. 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 (71 FR 43531). 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.

6.0 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.

7.0 REFERENCES

A complete list of references used to complete this review can be found in the NRC’s model SE published in the *Federal Register* on March 2, 2005 (70 FR 10298) and made available May 6, 2005 (70 FR 24126).

Principal Contributor: Trent L. Wertz

Date: February 13, 2007