NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION AND NOTICING ACTION

INITIAL

Docket No50-346	Facility: <u>Davis-Besse Unit 1</u>
Licensee: Toledo Edison Company	Date of application <u>May 2, 1983</u>
Request for: _ Extension of 18 month surv	veillance test due date on steam
	s of the Remote Shutdown Instrumentation
and Post Accident Instrumentation.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Initial Determination:

5/11/87

- (XX) <u>Proposed determination</u> amendment request involves no significant hazards considerations (NSHC).
- () <u>Final determination</u> conclusion cannot be made that the amendment request involves NSHC.
- Basis for Determination
 -) Licensee's NSHC discussion has been reviewed and is accepted.
 - (XX) Other (state). (1) The change does not involve a significant increase

in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The extension of the surveillance due date involves only a slight

increase in the probability that the instrumentation channels may have

drifted out of calibration. The interval from the previous calibration

to the proposed extended due date represents an extension normally

(attach additional pages as needed)

Initial Noticing Action: (Attach appropriate notice or input for monthly FRN)

- () <u>Monthly FRN</u>. Notice of opportunity for hearing (30 days) and request for comments on proposed NSHC determination -- monthly FRN input is attached (Attachment 8).
- 2. (XX) <u>Individual FRN</u>. Same notice matter as above. Time does not allow waiting for next monthly FRN (Attachments 9a and 9b).

9307220594 830511 PDR ADBCK 05000346

Basis for Determination

_ ~

allowable by existing Technical Specifications for a single surveillance interval but exceeds the permissible time for three successive calibration intervals by less than 7 percent. Previous testing and calibrations have found the instrumentation to be within FSAR tolerances.

(2) Does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated or;

(3) Does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

-) <u>No initial FRN</u>. Valid exigent circumstances exist (evaluated below). <u>Local media notice</u> requesting public comments on proposed NSHC determination is attached (Attachment 10).
- 4. () <u>No initial FRN or local media notice</u>. A valid emergency situation exists (evaluated below) and there is no time for public notice on proposed NSHC determination. (No attachment)
- 5. () <u>Individual FRN</u>. Licensee's claim of exigent or emergency circumstances is invalid (evaluated below). Notice of opportunity for hearing (30 days) and request for comments on proposed NSHC determination is attached (Attachments 9a and 9b). Letter of explanation to licensee is also attached.
- 6. () <u>Individual FRN</u>. Conclusion cannot be made that the amendment request involves NSHC. Notice of opportunity for prior hearing is attached (Attachment 5). Letter to licensee also attached.

Evaluation of exigent or emergency circumstances (if applicable):

. .

3.

/attach additional pages as needed)

Date Approvals: Albert W. De Agazio 5/10/83 1. Project Manager 183 John F. Sto 57. 2. Branch 3. OELD) Additional approvals (for noticing action types 4, 5 and 6): 4. (Assistant Director) 5. (Director, Division of Licensing)