



ATTACHMENT A

Technical Specification Page Revisions

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. Indian Point Unit No. 2 Docket No. 50-247 May 9, 1986

•

8605160413 860509 PDR ADOCK 05000247 PDR PDR

· · ·

3.10 CONTROL ROD AND POWER DISTRIBUTION LIMITS

Applicability:

Applies to the limits on core fission power distributions and to the limits on control rod operations.

Objectives:

To ensure:

- 1. Core subcriticality after reactor trip,
- 2. Acceptable core power distribution during power operation in order to maintain fuel integrity in normal operation and transients associated with faults of moderate frequency, supplemented by automatic protection and by administrative procedures, and to maintain the design basis initial conditions for limiting faults, and
- 3. Limit potential reactivity insertions caused by hypothetical control rod ejection.

Specifications:

3.10.1 Shutdown Reactivity

The shutdown margin shall be at least as great as shown in Figure 3.10-1.

3.10.2 Power Distribution Limits

- 3.10.2.1 At all times, except during low power physics tests, the hot channel factors defined in the basis must meet the following limits:
 - (a) $F^{N}_{AH} \leq 1.55 [1 + 0.3 (1-P)]$
 - (b) For ≤ 25% steam generator tube plugging:

 $F_{O}(Z) \leq (2.32/P) \times K(Z)$ for P > .5

 $F_O(Z) \leq (4.64) \times K(Z)$ for $P \leq .5$

Where P is the fraction of full power at which the core is operating; K(Z) is the fraction given in Figure 3.10-2 and Z is the core height location of F_{O} .

Amendment No.

3.10-1



•

Safety Assessment

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. Indian Point Unit No. 2 Docket No. 50-247 May 9,1986

SAFETY ASSESSMENT

Discussion:

The proposed changes to Technical Specification 3.10.2, contained in Attachment A to this Application, would correct certain typographical errors in the Indian Point Unit No. 2 proposed technical specification application dated April 10, 1985, and in the recently issued Amendment No. 110 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-26. Specifically, the proposed corrections are found in section 3.10.2.1(b) and include the insertion of a less than or equals sign preceeding 25% and the deletion of the denominator, P, following the factor 4.64.

Basis For No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination

The proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration because operating of Indian Point Unit No. 2 in accordance with this change would not:

- (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. This change merely eliminates typographical errors found in the recent amendment of Technical Specification 3.10. Therefore, this change cannot increase the probability or consequences of an accident.
- (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed. It has been determined that a new or different kind of accident will not be possible due to this change. This elimination of typographical errors does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.
- (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The correction of a typographical error in an amendment previously determined to preserve the margin of safety will not reduce the margin of safety.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards consideration. Example (i) relates to a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature.

In this case, the proposed change described in Attachment A is related to Example (i), i.e., correction of an error.

Therefore, since the application for amendment involves a proposed change that is similar to an example for which no significant hazards consideration exists, we have determined that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.



•

٠



The proposed changes have been reviewed by the Station Nuclear Safety Committee. The Committee concurs that these changes do not represent a significant hazards consideration and will not cause any change in the types or increase in the amounts of effluents or any change in the authorized power level of the facility.