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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 197 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 June 30, 1993, the Power Authority of the State of New York (the licensee) submitted a request for changes to the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant, Technical Specifications (TS). The requested changes would revise TS 3.7.A. and associated Bases to specify minimum and maximum water levels in the torus in terms of elevation above the bottom of the torus rather than in terms of depth of vent submergence. The second change would revise TS 4.7.A. and associated Bases to require torus inspections during each operating cycle rather than during each refueling outage. This change permits torus inspections to be conducted during mid-cycle outages as well as during refueling outages. The third change would also revise TS 4.7.A. and associated Bases to clarify the responsibility of the operator to observe suppression pool temperature and to require operator logging of suppression pool temperature when continuous recording is not available. The fourth change would correct editorial errors and clarify terminology in TSs 3.7.A., 4.7.A., and associated Bases.

2.0 EVALUATION

TS 3.7.A. currently requires vent submergence of between 50 inches and 51.5 inches. The first proposed change would change the specified limits to maximum and minimum levels of between 14.00 feet and 13.88 feet from the bottom of the torus. The instruments provided for control room readout of torus water level indicate water level relative to the bottom of the torus; the proposed change would make the TS limits consistent with these readouts. Specifying the water level limits in the same units as those displayed in the control room readouts is good human engineering practice. Except for a small (0.005 feet) conservative adjustment to reflect instrument accuracy, the water levels specified in the proposed change are equivalent to those in the current TS. Therefore, this proposed change is acceptable.

TS 4.7.A. currently requires an inspection for evidence of deterioration of the accessible interior surfaces of the drywell and above the water line of the torus at each refueling outage. The second proposed change would require this inspection to be performed each operating cycle which will maintain the same inspection interval (nominally once per 18 months which is the length of

the typical fuel cycle). Permission to perform this inspection during mid-cycle outages may also reduce occupational exposure. Therefore, we find this proposed change acceptable.

Currently, TS 4.7.A. also requires that during heat addition to the suppression pool the pool temperature be "continually monitored and also observed and logged every 5 minutes until the heat addition is terminated." The third proposed change would require that the pool be "continuously recorded until the heat addition is terminated." The proposed change would also require the operator to verify that the average temperature of the pool is within applicable limits every 5 minutes and would permit the operator to log the temperature every 5 minutes in lieu of using a continuous recorder. We have concluded that this proposed change will provide adequate monitoring of the suppression pool average water temperature to ensure that appropriate actions will be taken if required. Therefore, we find the proposed change acceptable.

The proposed editorial changes are purely administrative changes that do not change any limits and are, therefore, acceptable.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the New York State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment changes a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes surveillance requirements. The NRC 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 the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (58 FR 41512). Accordingly, the 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 the amendment.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission 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, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor:
Donald S. Brinkman

Date: September 9, 1993