



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 83 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 December 20, 1981, the Power Authority of the State of New York (the licensee) proposed certain changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) of Facility Operating License No. DPR-59 for the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant. The revisions to the Technical Specifications addressed in this Safety Evaluation regard the use of the term "operable" as it applies to safety systems in power reactors. The change proposed by the licensee includes a definition of "operable" as well as a section on operability requirements in the Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance section of the Technical Specifications. In particular the proposed change requires the normal or emergency power source as well as the safety system itself to be operable or the unit be placed in a condition required for the individual system itself. The change proposed by the licensee was in response to a generic letter issued to all licensees on April 10, 1980 on Multi-plant Item D-17. The letter provided Technical Specifications for each licensee and requested that they be adopted.

2.0 Evaluation

The staff has reviewed and endorses the finding in our contractor's Technical Evaluation Report (TER), EGG-EA-6480 dated January 1984 entitled "Definition of Operable, James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant." The report concludes and the staff concurs that the licensee's proposed amendment to the FitzPatrick TS provides adequate clarification of the term "OPERABLE" as it applies for safety-related systems and includes "Operability Requirements" in the Limiting Condition for Operation section of the Technical Specifications equivalent to those proposed in the model Technical Specifications issued by the staff. The TER is attached.*

*Although the Report contains a legend that this is "an informal report intended for use as a preliminary working document," the report in fact represents EG&G's final evaluation of this amendment request for NRC. These statements will be clarified in reports issued in the near future.

8409060024 840828
PDR ADOCK 05000333
P PDR

3.0 Environmental Consideration

This amendment involves a change in 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 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.

4.0 Conclusions

We have 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.

Principal Contributor: H. Abelson

Attachment:
Technical Evaluation
Report

Dated: August 28, 1984