**FENOC**
FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company

Beaver Valley Power Station
P.O. Box 4
Shippingport, PA 15077-0004

**Lew W. Myers**
Senior Vice President

724-682-5234
Fax: 724-643-8069

June 26, 2001
L-01-086

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attention: Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555-0001

**Subject: Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 1 and No. 2**
**BV-1 Docket No. 50-334, License No. DPR-66**
**BV-2 Docket No. 50-412, License No. NPF-73**
**License Amendment Request Nos. 289 and 161**
**Supplemental No Significant Hazards Evaluation for LARs 289 and 161**

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.90, FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC) requested an amendment to the above licenses in the form of changes to the technical specifications. The proposed changes were submitted by FENOC letter L-01-006, dated January 18, 2001. As per an NRC request, this letter provides a supplement to the no significant hazards evaluation submitted in L-01-006. This supplemental no significant hazards evaluation addresses two specific changes proposed in L-01-006. The first consists of changes to Technical Specification 3/4.4.9, "Pressure/Temperature Limits," for Beaver Valley Power Station (BVPS) Unit 2 only. The second consists of proposed changes to Technical Specification 3.7.1.1, "Main Steam Safety Valves (MSSVs)," for both BVPS units. The supplemental no significant hazard evaluation is presented in Attachment A of this letter.

This letter does not change any of the proposed technical specification changes proposed in L-01-006. It also does not change the conclusions of the safety evaluation, no significant hazard evaluation or environmental impact considerations submitted in L-01-006.

FENOC requests NRC approval of License Amendment Requests 289 and 161 to support implementation of the power uprate for the summer of 2001. An implementation period of up to 60 days is requested following the effective date of these amendments.

A001

If there are any questions concerning this matter, please contact Mr. Thomas S. Cosgrove, Manager, Regulatory Affairs at 724-682-5203.

Sincerely,

Lew W. Myers

c: Mr. L. J. Burkhart, Project Manager
Mr. D. M. Kern, Sr. Resident Inspector
Mr. H. J. Miller, NRC Region I Administrator
Mr. D. A. Allard, Director BRP/DEP
Mr. L. E. Ryan (BRP/DEP)

**Subject:** **Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 1 and No. 2**
**BV-1 Docket No. 50-334, License No. DPR-66**
**BV-2 Docket No. 50-412, License No. NPF-73**
**License Amendment Request Nos. 289 and 161**
**Supplemental No Significant Hazards Evaluation for LARs 289 and 161**

I, Marc P. Pearson, being duly sworn, state that I am Director, Nuclear Services of FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC), that I am authorized to sign and file this submittal with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on behalf of FENOC, and that the statements made and the matters set forth herein pertaining to FENOC are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company

Marc P. Pearson
Director, Nuclear Services - FENOC

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

COUNTY OF BEAVER

Subscribed and sworn to me, a Notary Public, in and for the County and State above named, this 26th day of June, 2001.

Tracey A. Baczek
My Commission Expires:

Notarial Seal
Tracey A. Baczek, Notary Public
Shippingport Boro, Beaver County
My Commission Expires Aug. 16, 2001
Member, Pennsylvania Association of Notaries

NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS EVALUATION

For Beaver Valley Power Station (BVPS) Unit 1 and 2, two of the changes proposed in License Amendment Requests 289 and 161 are addressed by this supplemental no significant hazards consideration. These proposed changes consist of the following:

- Unit 2 Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.4.9, "Pressure/Temperature Limits" contain heatup/cooldown curves, i.e., Figures 3.4-2 and 3.4-3 (sheets 1-5). These curves are being revised from 15 Effective Full Power Years (EFPY) to 14 EFPY. The applicable Bases pages are also revised to reflect the change in EFPYs.
- Technical Specification 3.7.1.1, "Main Steam Safety Valves (MSSVs)," for both BVPS units is being revised to be consistent with Technical Specification Traveler Form-235 (TSTF-235) Revision 1 and the Improved Standard Technical Specifications (ISTS).

The applicable Index, Technical Specifications and Bases will be augmented and repaginated as necessary to meet format requirements.

The no significant hazards considerations involved with the proposed amendments have been evaluated. The evaluation focused on the three standards set forth in 10 CFR 50.92(c), as quoted below:

> The Commission may make a final determination, pursuant to the procedures in paragraph 50.91, that a proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility licensed under paragraph 50.21(b) or paragraph 50.22 or a testing facility involves no significant hazards considerations, if 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.

The following evaluation is provided for the no significant hazards consideration standards:

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

   The proposed change to the Effective Full Power Years (EFPY) for the Unit 2 reactor coolant system heatup/cooldown curves are being made to impose a conservative projection of the increase in neutron fluence associated with a proposed 1.4% power uprate. This projection will ensure that the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix G, "Fracture Toughness Requirements," will continue to be met following the proposed uprate. Thus, there is no significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes to the Main Steam Safety Valve (MSSV) Technical Specifications will not reduce the valve's capability to provide pressure relief when required. The design basis events that were protected against by the heatup/cooldown curves and the MSSVs have not changed; therefore, the probability of an accident previously evaluated is not increased by these proposed changes. These proposed changes also do not alter any assumptions previously made in the radiological consequence evaluations, nor affect mitigation of the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not result in a significant increase in the probability or 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 new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms or single failures are introduced as a result of the proposed changes. All systems, structures, and components previously required for the mitigation of an event remain capable of fulfilling their intended design function. The proposed changes have no adverse effects on any safety-related system or component and do not challenge the performance or integrity of any safety related system.

Therefore, the proposed changes do 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 a margin of safety?

The proposed change to the EFPYs for the Unit 2 reactor coolant system heatup/cooldown curves preserves the margin of safety by imposing a conservative projection of the increase in neutron fluence associated with the proposed 1.4% power uprate.

The design basis for the MSSVs is to limit the secondary system pressure to $\leq$ 110% of design pressure for any anticipated operational occurrence (AOO) or accident considered in the Design Basis Accident (DBA) and transient analysis. All cases analyzed demonstrate that the MSSVs maintain Main Steam System integrity by limiting the maximum steam pressure to less than 110% of system design pressure. Since the design basis of the MSSVs is maintained, there is no significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION

Based on the considerations evaluated above, it is concluded that the proposed License Amendment Request satisfies the "no significant hazards consideration" standards of 10 CFR 50.92, and accordingly a no significant hazards finding is justified.