



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 61 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 September 18, 1981 the Power Authority of the State of New York (PASNY) requested interim relief from the Technical Specification requirement for annual performance of site evacuation exercises. This proposed interim relief would have postponed the initial evacuation drill from 1981 to 1982. PASNY did not, however, propose to change the requirement to conduct a drill each year subsequent to the initial drill. Justification for postponing the initial drill to 1982 was based upon the fact that James A. FitzPatrick and Nine Mile Point (Unit 1) Nuclear Power Plants are located at the same site and that an exercise was conducted at that site by the Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation on September 18, 1981. By subsequent submittal, dated December 31, 1981, PASNY requested deletion of the emergency planning Technical Specification requirements, based on redundancy with Section 50.54 to 10 CFR Part 50.

2.0 EVALUATION

The existing Technical Specifications require that PASNY conduct a site evacuation exercise on an annual basis. However, this requirement is also specified as a license condition as set forth in paragraphs (q) and (t) of Section 50.54 to 10 CFR Part 50. Therefore, we find that the emergency planning Technical Specification section can be deleted without effecting emergency planning requirements. Additionally, the deletion of this Technical Specification section will place James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant on a performance schedule of April 1, 1982; which is consistent with the schedule required of other operating nuclear power plants.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

8201250503 811231
PDR ADOCK 05000333
P PDR

4.C CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) 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: December 31, 1981