October 11, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: James R. Miller, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #3
Division of Licensing

FROM: Steven A. Varga, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #1
Division of Licensing

Distribution
Docket File
NRC PDR
Local PDR
ORB#1 Rdg.
Memo file
CParrish
PTam

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR PUBLICATION IN MONTHLY FR NOTICE - NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE AND PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING

Duquesne Light Company, Docket No. 50-334, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 1, Shippingport, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: September 5, 1984

Description of amendment request: This is an application for an amendment to Opertating License DPR-66, revising the Technical Specifications as follows:

(1) Currently, Specification 3.3.3.6.a requires that a fire watch patrol inspect fire zones when less than the minimum number of fire detection instruments are operable, regardless of where the zones are located. The proposed change would relax this to allow such an inspection to be performed at 8-hour intervals, or in lieu of an inspection, air temperature be monitored at 8-hour intervals, if the affected fire zone is inside containment. The proposed change, however, would conform with staff position as stated in the Standard Technical Specifications for Westinghouse Pressurized Water Reactors (NUREG-0452, Rev. 4).

(2) The current Specification 4.3.3.6.1 requires that each fire detection instrument be demonstrated operable by performance of a channel functional test at six-month intervals. The proposed amendment would change the schedule for instruments not accessible during normal operation such that

8410260257 841011
PDR ADOCK 05000334
P PDR

the test would be done "during each cold shutdown exceeding 24 hours unless performed in the previous 6 months". This also is a slight relaxation but nevertheless, conforms with NUREG-0452, Rev. 4.

Relaxation of the surveillance requirements in the manner described above may slightly increase the probability of a fire not being detected, but the proposed requirements conform with current staff position on the subject matter.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of these, Example (vi), involving no significant hazards considerations is "a change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously-analyzed accident, or may reduce in some way safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan." The guidance document referenced is not the Standard Review Plan but NUREG-0452, Rev. 4. With only this variation, the proposed amendment matches the example and the staff, therefore, proposes to characterize is as involving no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania 15001

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esquire, Jay E. Silberg, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga

/s/SAVarga

Steven A. Varga, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #1
Division of Licensing

ORB#1:DL	ORB#1:DL	C-ORB#1:DL	OELD
CParrish	PTam/ts	SVarga	
10/2/84	9/12/84	10/2/84	9/11/84