

August 23, 1983

Note to J. Hegner

SUBJECT: FITZPATRICK - CYCLE 6 RELOAD (OELD # 836 264)

The description of the amendment in the first paragraph of the SER and the description of the amendment to be put in the monthly notice should sound a little like the notice of proposed action published in connection with this amendment on June 20. I am attaching a xeroxed copy of the page from the Federal Register. Please have the description of the amendment in the as-issued package look somewhat closer to the description of the amendment as it was put out in the as-proposed package on June 20. You can add the additional information that you have in the description of the amendment and the SER and in the package attached. That information can be added to the information contained in the description of the amendment and the notice you proposed. But it shouldn't sound quite so far apart. If you and Mr. Goddard can agree by phone on the language of the change, the package does not need to come back to ELD. However, immediately before the amendment is issued, check to see whether any petitions or comments were received. If so, come back to ELD before the amendment is issued.

Amf
Joe Scinto

Attachment

cc w/attachment:
R. Goddard

B502090234 B40518
PDR FOIA
ADAT084-166 PDR

Power Authority of the State of New York, Docket No. 50-333, James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant, Oswego County, New York

Date of amendment request: January 6, 1981.

Description of amendment request: An amendment to modify the Technical Specifications pertaining to four miscellaneous matters: the first change proposes to delete, from the Bases, the pressure setpoint for permissible entry into the Run mode, and to correct that setpoint in the Definitions to be consistent with the same setpoint in the corresponding Limiting Conditions for Operation; the second change proposes to correct an apparent error in the list of valve isolation groups which isolate on a high drywell pressure signal; the third change proposes to correct an error in the list of inputs to the Rod Worth Minimizer; and the fourth change proposes to correct specifications pertaining to the low Pressure Coolant Injection (LPCI) system that should have been modified as a result of a previously approved amendment involving the LPCI system.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: 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). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include: " * * (i) A purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature.

The changes proposed in the application for amendment are encompassed by this example in that: the first proposed change regarding pressure setpoint for entering the Run mode is intended to achieve consistency throughout the specifications; the second change proposes to correct a typographical error; the third change proposes to correct an incorrectly specified input to the Rod Worth Minimizer; and the fourth change proposes to delete specifications no longer applicable and modify certain narrative descriptions as a result of a previously approved change. Thus, the proposed changes are similar to the example cited above in that they are intended to either achieve consistency of the specifications or correct errors.

Therefore, since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are purely administrative, the

staff has made a proposed determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Penfield Library, State University College of Oswego, Oswego, New York.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Charles M. Pratt, Assistant General Counsel, Power Authority of the State of New York, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, NY 10019.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Power Authority of the State of New York, Docket No. 50-333, James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant, Oswego County, New York

Date of amendment request: May 25, 1983.

Description of amendment requests: An amendment to the license supporting the forthcoming Cycle 6 core reload. The reload involves removing depleted fuel assemblies in about one-third of the nuclear reactor core and replacing them with new fuel of the same type previously loaded in the core.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: In accordance with the rule, the licensee made a determination that no significant hazards consideration was involved in this application for amendment. The staff informed the licensee that, in addition to the determination, the supporting bases for such determination should be included in the submittal. The bases cited by the licensee during subsequent discussion was one of the examples in the guidance provided by NRC concerning application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (48 FR 14870): " * * (iii) For a nuclear power reactor, a change resulting from a nuclear core reloading, if no fuel assemblies significantly different from those found previously acceptable to the NRC for a previous core at the facility in question are involved. This assumes that no significant changes are made to the acceptance criteria for the technical specifications, that the analytical methods used to demonstrate conformance with the technical specifications and regulations are not significant changes, and that NRC has previously found such methods acceptable."

The change proposed in the application for amendment is encompassed by this example in that the proposed reload involves fuel assemblies of the same type as previously found acceptable by the staff and loaded in the core in previous cycles. The analytical methods used by

the licensee to demonstrate conformance to the technical specifications have been previously approved by the staff. In addition, no changes have been made to the acceptance criteria for the technical specification changes involved. Thus, the proposed change is similar to the example cited above.

Therefore, since the application for amendment involves a proposed change that is similar to an example for which no significant hazards consideration exists, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Penfield Library, State University College of Oswego, Oswego, New York.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Charles M. Pratt, Assistant General Counsel, Power Authority of the State of New York, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, NY 10019.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Power Authority of the State of New York, Docket No. 50-333, James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant, Oswego County, New York

Date of amendment request: November 18, 1981.

Description of amendment request: An amendment to the Technical Specifications pertaining to the surveillance frequency of the Control Rod Drives (CRDs). The proposed change would restore the CRD surveillance frequency from the current 15 percent of operable drives at 8 week intervals back to the original surveillance frequency of 10 percent of the operable drives at 16 week intervals.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: An operating restriction had previously been imposed by the staff (see Amendment No. 30 to License No. DPR-59) that increased the surveillance frequency of the CRDs as a result of staff concerns regarding the effects of increased reverse flow on scram reliability. In its Safety Evaluation dated September 16, 1977 the staff states that it believed that these conditions would increase the likelihood of foreign materials to collect in the drive mechanisms over a period of time. This material could potentially adversely affect the operation of the CRDs, and also cause accelerated wear. To compensate for this apparent reduced reliability of the CRDs, the licensee proposed to increase the surveillance requirements. This increase in surveillance would continue until the