

# SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

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

## RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO.136 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

#### 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND EVALUATION

By letter dated August 29, 1988, Consolidated Edison requested approval of an amendment to the Indian Point 2 Technical Specifications. The amendment would correct a typographical error pertaining to the location of a hose station in the Fuel Storage Building. Specifically, the location of the Southeast End hose station is changed from 104 ft. to 140 ft. We have reviewed the proposed amendment and conclude that the change is justified and necessary in order to accurately reflect in-plant conditions.

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a charge to a requirement with respect to 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 occupational 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.

#### 3.0 CONCLUSION

The staff 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, 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.

Phi

8902100459 890206

ADOCK 05000247

PDR

Dated: February 6, 1989

## PRINCIPAL CONTRIBUTOR:

D. Kubicki

1



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

# SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO.136 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

#### **1.0 INTRODUCTION AND EVALUATION**

By letter dated August 29, 1988, Consolidated Edison requested approval of an amendment to the Indian Point ? Technical Specifications. The amendment would correct a typographical error pertaining to the location of a hose station in the Fuel Storage Building. Specifically, the location of the Southeast End hose station is changed from 104 ft. to 140 ft. We have reviewed the proposed amendment and conclude that the change is justified and necessary in order to accurately reflect in-plant conditions.

#### 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a charge to a requirement with respect to 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 occupational 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.

#### 3.0 CONCLUSION

The staff 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, 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: February 6, 1989

## PRINCIPAL CONTRIBUTOR:

D. Kubicki