

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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 111 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

INTRODUCTION

Ry letters dated July 11, 1986, October 27, 1986, and June 4, 1987, the Power Authority of the State of New York (PASNY) (the licensee), requested an amendment to the Administrative Controls Section of the Technical Specifications (TS) for the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant. Specifically, the proposed changes requested by the licensee would revise the TS to add an Assistant Shift Supervisor with an SRO license to the plant staff and allow the use of a dual role Senior Reactor Operator/Shift Technical Advisor (SRO/STA) in the operating shift organization. The proposed TS also allows for the separate STA position to be used. A special footnote is added to Section 6.3 which allows for the 13 individuals who hold SRO licenses, and have completed the FitzPatrick Advanced Technical Training Program prior to the issuance of this license amendment to be considered for the dual-role SRO/STA position as specified in the Commission's Policy Statement on Engineering Expertise on Shift (50 FR 43621). In addition, the proposed amendment includes changes to Section 6.2, Plant Staff Organization.

EVALUATION

Section 6.2, Plant Staff Organization

Sections 6.2.1-6.2.7 and 6.2.10 have been deleted and have been replaced with a new table (Table 6.2-1) prescribing the minimum shift manning requirements. The requirements of this table are consistent with applicable sections of 10 CFR 50.54. The new Section 6.2.1 refers to Table 5.2-1 for a description of the minimum shift crew composition. The new 6.2.2 was formerly included in footnote (a) to Section 6.2.5. The new 6.2.3 and 6.2.4 were formerly 6.2.9 and 6.2.8 respectively and the wording remains the same.

These changes have been made to be consistent with applicable sections of 10 CFR 50.54 and are, therefore, acceptable.

Figure 6.2-1, Plant Staff Organization

Figure 6.2-1 has been revised to add a second SRO (Assistant Shift Supervisor) to the shift staff in order to incorporate previous licensee commitments to meet NUREG-0737 requirements. In addition, two notes have been included in Figure 6.2-1. The one pound sign indicates that either the Shift Supervisor or Assistant Shift Supervisor may be a dual-role SRO/STA in accordance with Section 6.3.2. The two pound sign indicates that the STA position is present only when option 2 of the Commission Policy Statement on Engineering Expertise on Shift is in effect.

These revisions are acceptable for they reflect the changes described and accepted in Section 6.2 and Section 6.3 of this Safety Evaluation.

Section 6.3, Plant Staff Qualifications

The proposed changes to Section 6.3.2 of the TS read as follows:

"6.3.2 The Shift Technical Advisor (STA) shall meet or exceed the minimum requirements of either Option 1 (Combined SRO/STA Position) or Option 2 (Continued use of STA Position) as defined in the Commission Policy Statement on Engineering Expertise on Shift, published in the October 28, 1985 Federal Register (50 FR 43621). When invoking Option 1, the STA role may be filled by the Shift Supervisor or Assistant Shift Supervisor. (1)"

"Note:

(1) The 13 individuals who hold SRO licenses, and have completed the FitzPatrick Advanced Technical Training Program prior to the issuance of this license amendment, shall be considered qualified as dual-role SRO/STAs."

The licensee has committed that the STA position shall meet or exceed the minimum requirements of either Option 1 (Combined SRO/STA Position) or Option 2 (Continued use of STA Position) of the Policy Statement on Engineering Expertise on shift, except for the special condition specified in the footnote. The staff finds that this proposed change is acceptable since it meets the guidance provided in the Commission's Policy Statement on Engineering Expertise on Shift.

In the footnote to Section 6.3.2 the licensee has proposed that the 13 individuals who are SROs and who have successfully completed the FitzPatrick Advanced Technical Training Program are qualified to serve at FitzPatrick in a dual-role SRO/STA capacity. Originally the licensee chose to base the educational qualifications of the dual-role (SRO/STA) individuals on staff papers such as SECY-84-355, SECY-85-50, and SECY-85-150, all of which discussed the Proposed Commission's Policy Statement on Engineering Expertise on Shift.

In a letter dated December 11, 1984, (D.B. Vassallo to J.P. Bayne), the staff concluded in a Safety Evaluation that individuals at the Fitz'atrick plant who hold a valid SRO license and who had successfully completed the Advanced Technical Training Program were qualified to serve in a dual-role SRO/STA capacity and should be able to provide adequate engineering and accident assessment expertise. This previous approval of the dual-role SRO/STA at FitzPatrick was based on the guidance available to the staff at that time. The staff finds that the footnote, therefore, should still be acceptable for those 13 individuals based on the staff's previous evaluation of their specific training and qualification, i.e., the 13 individuals still have adequate training and qualifications necessary to serve in the dual-role capacity and provide engineering and accident assessment expertise. However, all other personnel filling the dual-role (SRO/STA) position will meet the qualifications criteria of the Policy Statement on Engineering Expertise on Shift.

The June 4, 1987 submittal combines and revises the submittals of July 11 and October 27, 1987 and contains no substantive changes.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change in administrative procedures or 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 Sec 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.

CONCLUSION

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.

Dated: August 21, 1987

PRINCIPAL CONTRIBUTOR:

I. Schoenfeld