

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

#### SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

#### SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 84 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 a letter dated July 25, 1984, from J. P. Bayne to D. B. Vassallo, the Power Authority of the State of New York (PASNY/the licensee) requested changes to the Technical Specifications for the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant. The proposed changes are made in conjunction with a change to the actuation logic for the Automatic Depressurization System (ADS). The change to the ADS logic eliminates the high drywell pressure permissive for ADS actuation. This modification was approved by the staff in references 1 and 2.

## 2.0 Evaluation

The licensee has specified the following changes to the Technical Specifications:

- 1. A new section 4.5.D.1.c has been added that requires surveillance testing of the override switches once per operating cycle. This is consistent with the staff safety evaluation given in reference 2.
- 2. Four changes were made to Table 3.2-2 ("Instrumentation That Initiates or Controls the Core and Containment Systems"):
  - a) On page 66, Item No. 2 (Reactor Low-Low Water Level Trip Function) eliminates "...high drywell pressure..." from the remark associated with the ADS instrument channels and adds the phrase "if not inhibited by ADS override switches." This is appropriate since the plant modification removes the high drywell pressure permissive for ADS actuation, and adds override switches.
  - b) On page 67, Item No. 6 (Confirmatory Low Level) the remarks entry is revised to include the phrase "in conjunction with reactor Low-Low-Low Water Level." This is a clarification only and does not reflect any plant modifications.

### 3.0 Environmental Consideration

This amendment involves changes in the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes in surveillance requirements. 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.

# 5.0 References

- D. B. Vassallo to J. P. Bayne "Response to NUREG-0737, Item II.K.3.18 ADS Modification," dated June 5, 1984.
- D. B. Vassallo to J. P. Bayne "NUREG-0737, Item II.K.3.18, ADS Logic Modifications" dated June 3, 1983.

Principal Contributor: T. Collins

Dated: October 11, 1984