



# Entergy

Entergy Nuclear Northeast  
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.  
James A. Fitzpatrick NPP  
P.O. Box 110  
Lycoming, NY 13093  
Tel 315-342-3840

Pete Dietrich  
Site Vice President

May 11, 2009  
JAFP-09-0056

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
ATTN: Document Control Desk  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

SUBJECT: James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant  
Docket No. 50-333  
License No. DPR-59  
**Summary of Plant and Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation  
Changes, Tests, and Experiments for 2007 and 2008 as Required by  
10 CFR 50.59 and 10 CFR 72.48**

Dear Sir or Madam:

This letter transmits the summary of changes, tests and experiments implemented at the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant (JAF) for the years 2007 and 2008 as required by 10 CFR 50.59(d)(2) and 10 CFR 72.48(d)(2).

During this period there were no changes to the Independent Spent fuel Storage Installation requiring a 10 CFR 72.48 Evaluation. The plant changes requiring evaluation under 10 CFR 50.59 are summarized in Attachment 1.

There are no new commitments made in this letter.

Should you have any questions concerning this report, please direct them to Mr. Joseph Pechacek, Licensing Manager, at (315) 349-6766.

Very truly yours,

  
Pete Dietrich  
Site Vice President

PD:JP:mh

Attachment: 1. Summary of 10 CFR 50.59 Reports for 2007 and 2008  
cc: next page

IE47  
NIRK

cc: Mr. Samuel Collins  
Regional Administrator  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
475 Allendale Road  
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Office of the Resident Inspector  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
P.O. Box 136  
Lycoming, NY 13093

Mr. Bhalchandra Vaidya, Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch I-1  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mail Stop O-8-C2  
Washington, DC 20555

**ATTACHMENT 1**  
**JAFP-09-0056**

**Summary of 10 CFR 50.59 Reports for 2007 and 2008**

James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant  
Docket No. 50-333  
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc

## **2007 Summary**

### **JAF-SE-07-001, Rev. 0: Use of Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD) Fuel (< 15 ppm Sulfur) In JAF Diesel Generators**

**ACTIVITY TYPE:**     **Design Change**

Engineering Change EC-0551 evaluated the impact of reduced sulfur content on the available heat content in fuel oil. The 50.59 evaluation addressed use of a time dependent loading in the calculation method as well as the change in sulfur content. The evaluation concluded that use of ultra low sulfur diesel fuel was acceptable.

This 50.59 Evaluation is withdrawn. Based on issues raised during the 2007 Component Design Bases Inspection it was necessary to revise the calculation method and add additional conservatism into the calculation. Based on using an NRC approved methodology it was determined that a 50.59 Evaluation was not required.

### **JAF-SE-07-002, Rev. 0: Implementation of the Maximum Extended Operating Domain (MEOD)**

**ACTIVITY TYPE:**     **Evaluation**

EC 5000018317 documents the bases for use of an expanded operating map (the set of allowable reactor power / core flow conditions for plant operation) known as the Maximum Extended Operating Domain (MEOD). This 50.59 evaluation reviewed the analyses and evaluations in the engineering change to determine if MEOD could be implemented without prior NRC concurrence. The conclusion was that MEOD could be implemented contingent upon NRC approval of the Average Power Range Monitor, Rod Block Monitor Technical Specification (ARTS) Improvement Amendment. NRC approved ARTS in JAF Amendment 287 and MEOD was implemented based on the conclusions of this 50.59.

## **2008 Summary**

### **JAF-SE-08-001, Rev. 0: Cycle 19 Core Reload**

#### **ACTIVITY TYPE: Evaluation**

This 50.59 evaluation evaluated the use of GNF-2 fuel in the cycle 19 core reload. The evaluation focused on an exposure limitation imposed on the GNF-2 Fuel. NRC had identified a potential non-conservatism in the licensed fuel thermal-mechanical analysis code (GESTR-M). The evaluation concluded that the imposition of a fuel burn-up limit, that prevented the fuel from reaching the point where the potential non-conservatism could affect the analysis of the fuel was acceptable for Cycle 19.