

February 22, 2000

Mr. A. Alan Blind  
Vice President, Nuclear Power  
Consolidated Edison Company  
of New York, Inc.  
Broadway and Bleakley Avenue  
Buchanan, NY 10511

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO  
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT  
HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY  
FOR A HEARING - INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NO. 2  
(TAC NO. MA6236)

Dear Mr. Blind:

The Commission has requested the Office of Federal Register to publish the enclosed "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing." This notice relates to your application for amendment dated July 26, 1999, as supplemented by letter dated January 20, 2000, which would revise Technical Specifications associated with the degraded voltage trip and the under-frequency reactor trip surveillance tests.

Sincerely,

***/RA/***

Jefferey F. Harold, Project Manager, Section 1  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-247

Enclosure: Notice of Consideration

cc w/encl: See next page

February 22, 2000

Mr. A. Alan Blind  
Vice President, Nuclear Power  
Consolidated Edison Company  
of New York, Inc.  
Broadway and Bleakley Avenue  
Buchanan, NY 10511

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING - INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NO. 2 (TAC NO. MA6236)

Dear Mr. Blind:

The Commission has requested the Office of Federal Register to publish the enclosed "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing." This notice relates to your application for amendment dated July 26, 1999, as supplemented by letter dated January 20, 2000, which would revise Technical Specifications associated with the degraded voltage trip and the under-frequency reactor trip surveillance tests.

Sincerely,

**/RA**

Jefferey F. Harold, Project Manager, Section 1  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-247

Enclosure: Notice of Consideration

cc w/encl: See next page

Distribution:

File Center                   ACRS  
PUBLIC                        M. Oprendeck, RGN-I  
PDI-1 R/F  
E. Adensam (e-mail)  
M. Gamberoni  
S. Little  
J. Harold  
OGC

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\INDNOTA6236.WPD

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	PM:PDI-1	E	LA:PDI-1	SC:PDI-1				
NAME	JHarold/		SLittle	MGamberoni				
DATE	02/22/00		02/22/00	02/22/00				

Official Record Copy

Indian Point Nuclear Generating Station  
Units 1/2

Mayor, Village of Buchanan  
236 Tate Avenue  
Buchanan, NY 10511

Mr. F. William Valentino, President  
New York State Energy, Research,  
and Development Authority  
Corporate Plaza West  
286 Washington Ave. Extension  
Albany, NY 12203-6399

Mr. John McCann  
Manager of Nuclear Safety and  
Licensing  
Consolidated Edison Company  
of New York, Inc.  
Broadway and Bleakley Avenue  
Buchanan, NY 10511

Senior Resident Inspector  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
P.O. Box 38  
Buchanan, NY 10511

Mr. Brent L. Brandenburg  
Assistant General Counsel  
Consolidated Edison Company  
of New York, Inc.  
4 Irving Place - 1822  
New York, NY 10003

Charles Donaldson, Esquire  
Assistant Attorney General  
New York Department of Law  
120 Broadway  
New York, NY 10271

Ms. Charlene D. Faison, Director  
Nuclear Licensing  
Power Authority of the State  
of New York  
123 Main Street  
White Plains, NY 10601

Mr. Thomas Rose  
Secretary - NFSC  
Consolidated Edison Company  
Of New York, Inc.  
708 First Avenue  
New York, NY 10017

Regional Administrator, Region I  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
475 Allendale Road  
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Mr. Paul Eddy  
New York State Department of  
Public Service  
3 Empire State Plaza, 10th Floor  
Albany, NY 12223

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

DOCKET NO. 50-247

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO  
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS  
CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-26 issued to Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc (the licensee) for operation of the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2, located in Westchester County, New York.

The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specifications (TSs) associated with the degraded voltage trip and the under-frequency reactor trip surveillance tests. For the degraded voltage trip, the proposed amendment would revise TS to specify detailed operator actions to be taken if the minimum conditions could not be met rather than simply stating "Cold Shutdown." The 6.9 kV under-frequency and reactor trip surveillance tests currently combine voltage and frequency testing under one item. The proposed TS amendment would separate the 6.9 kV voltage testing from the frequency testing and specify separate test requirements. In addition, the proposed TS amendment would require more frequent testing of the 480 volt emergency bus undervoltage reactor trip.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

The proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration because:

1. Does the proposed license amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

No. This proposed change is administrative in nature. This change does not affect possible initiating events for accidents previously evaluated or alter the configuration or operation of the facility. The Limiting Safety System Settings and Safety Limits specified in the current Technical Specifications remain unchanged. Therefore, the proposed change would not involve a significant increase in the probability or in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

No. This proposed change is administrative in nature. The safety analysis of the facility remains complete and accurate. There are no physical changes to the facility and the plant conditions for which the design basis accidents have been evaluated are still valid. Consequently no new failure modes are introduced as a result of the proposed change. Therefore, the proposed change would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety?

No. This proposed change is administrative in nature. Since there are no changes to the operation or the physical design of the facility, the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) design basis, accident assumptions, or Technical specification Bases are not affected. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the FEDERAL REGISTER a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this FEDERAL REGISTER notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D59, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By March 29, 2000, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be

affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (<http://www.nrc.gov>). If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.



If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and to Mr. Brent L. Brandenburg, Assistant General Counsel, Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place - 1822, New York, NY 10003, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated July 26, 1999, as supplemented on January 20, 2000, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (<http://www.nrc.gov>).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of February 2000.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

***/RA/***

Jefferey F. Harold, Project Manager, Section 1  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation