



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 137 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-26

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-247

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated August 18, 1986, Consolidated Edison Company (licensee) proposed changes and additions to the Indian Point 2 Technical Specifications which would require the operability and surveillance testing of the shunt trip attachments of the reactor trip breakers as required by Generic Letter 83-28, Item 4.3. The original required changes were clarified and modified by Generic Letter 85-09. The licensee's proposal was reviewed and additional changes to make the Technical Specifications conform more fully to the requirements of Generic Letter 85-09 were made during a meeting with the licensee held on December 12, 1988. These changes were incorporated by the licensee's submittal of January 25, 1989 and are reviewed in this SER.

2.0 EVALUATION

The licensee's Technical Specifications differ in many respects from the Standard Westinghouse Technical Specifications which were used as the basis for the requirements of Generic Letter 85-09. Consequently, the changes proposed in the August 18, 1986 letter addressing the operability and surveillance test requirements for the shunt trip attachment of the reactor trip breakers did not fully meet the requirements of Generic Letter 85-09. In a meeting with the staff on December 12, 1988, the licensee agreed that the originally proposed allowed out-of-service time (AOT) of 48 hours with one train inoperable would be changed to six hours which is in accordance with Generic Letter 85-09 recommendations. The licensee's submittal of January 25, 1989 contained this change.

The modified Technical Specification changes now provide for testing the manual reactor trip switch functions independently for the shunt and undervoltage trip attachments of the reactor trip breakers and the reactor trip switch contacts and wiring at each refueling outage. The action statements for Items 18 (Reactor Trip Logic), 19 (Reactor Trip Breakers), and a note to Table 3.5-2 were changed to conform more closely to the guidance of Generic Letter 85-09. The previous Technical Specification changes contained in the licensee's submittal of August 18, 1986 which addressed changes to

8904200157 890410
PDR ADOCK 05000247
P PNU

Item 25 and added Items 42, 43, and 44 to Table 4.1-1 were left in place. The licensee's test procedure PT-M14A was revised to reflect the installation of the automatic shunt trip modification. In addition, the licensee proposed increasing the time a reactor trip breaker or its associated logic channel could be bypassed for maintenance or surveillance testing from the two hours specified in Generic Letter 85-09 to eight hours. This increased AOT is required to perform the required surveillance test since Indian Point Unit 2 uses relay protection logic rather than solid state protection logic as was envisioned when the requirements of Generic Letter 85-09 were developed. We agree that relay protection logic requires this additional amount of time to perform the required testing.

3.0 CONCLUSION

We find that the proposed changes to the Indian Point Unit 2 Technical Specifications presented in the licensee's submittals and agreed to in the December 12, 1988 meeting meet the requirements of both Generic Letter 83-28, Item 4.3 and Generic Letter 85-09 and are, therefore, acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment changes a requirement with respect to the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area, as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes surveillance requirements. The staff has determined that this amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released off site, 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: April 10, 1989

PRINCIPAL CONTRIBUTOR:

D. Lasher