

March 9, 1988

Docket No.: 50-346  
Serial No. DB-87-005

Mr. Donald C. Shelton  
Vice President, Nuclear  
Toledo Edison Company  
Edison Plaza - Stop 712  
300 Madison Avenue  
Toledo, Ohio 43652

DISTRIBUTION  
Docket File  
NRC & Local PDRs  
PD33 Gray File  
GHolahan  
PKreutzer  
ADeAgazio  
OGC-WF1  
DHagan  
EJordan

JPartlow  
TBarnhart(4)  
Wanda Jones  
EButcher  
ACRS(10)  
GPA/PA  
ARM/LFMB  
KPerkins

Dear Mr. Shelton:

SUBJECT: AMENDMENT NO. 109 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-3;  
STATION REVIEW BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES (TAC NO. 61468)

RE: Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 109 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-3 for the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1. This amendment consists of changes to the Appendix A Technical Specifications (TS's) in response to your application dated January 22, 1986 (No. 1235), as clarified by your letters dated August 25 (No. 1418) and December 28, 1987 (No. 1455), January 15, 1988 (No. 1467), and February 17, 1988 (No. 1478).

This amendment revises the responsibilities and authority of the Station Review Board and adds a section on Technical Review and Control. The amendment involves TS Sections 6.5.1.3, 6.5.1.6, 6.5.1.7, 6.5.3, 6.8.2, and 6.8.3.

On February 18, 1987 the Commission issued Amendment No. 98 which approved changes to certain position titles which also were requested in your January 22, 1986 application. The Commission has denied one change requested in your application which would have deleted the requirement specified in TS Section 6.5.1.6.e.

In response to your letter dated May 4, 1987 (No. 1375), this amendment also includes TS page 3/4 6-18. This page is reissued to correct a typographical error which occurred when we issued Amendment No. 79.

8803180249 880309  
PDR ADDCK 05000346  
P PDR

Mr. Shelton

-2-

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. Notice of issuance will be included in the Commission's next biweekly Federal Register notice. A separate Notice of Denial of Amendment (copy enclosed) is being forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

*/s/*

Albert W. De Agazio, Project Manager  
Project Directorate III-3  
Division of Reactor Projects - III, IV, V  
& Special Projects

Enclosures:

- 1. Amendment No. 109 to License No. NPF-3
- 2. Safety Evaluation
- 3. Notice of Denial

cc w/enclosures:  
See next page

Office: LA/PDIII-3  
Surname: PKrautzer  
Date: 3/9/88

PM/PDIII-3  
ADeAgazio/tg  
3/9/88

PD/PDIII-3  
KPerkins\*  
1/88

*Veritas encountered  
9/1/89*

OGC-WF1  
1/88

AB/DRS  
GHolahan  
3/9/88

*By Scioto Note 9/1/87 attached  
legal concern re 50.59  
resolved by change proposed  
by licensee to section 6.5.3  
2/27/88*

Mr. Donald C. Shelton  
Toledo Edison Company

Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station  
Unit No. 1

cc:

Donald H. Hauser, Esq.  
The Cleveland Electric  
Illuminating Company  
P. O. Box 5000  
Cleveland, Ohio 44101

Radiological Health Program  
Ohio Department of Health  
1224 Kinnear Road  
Columbus, Ohio 43212

Mr. Robert W. Schrauder  
Manager, Nuclear Licensing  
Toledo Edison Company  
Edison Plaza  
300 Madison Avenue  
Toledo, Ohio 43652

Attorney General  
Department of Attorney  
General  
30 East Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Gerald Charnoff, Esq.  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts  
and Trowbridge  
2300 N Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037

Mr. James W. Harris, Director  
(Addressee Only)  
Division of Power Generation  
Ohio Department of Industrial Relations  
2323 West 5th Avenue  
P. O. Box 825  
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Regional Administrator, Region III  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
799 Roosevelt Road  
Glen Ellyn, Illinois

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency  
361 East Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0558

Mr. Robert B. Borsum  
Babcock & Wilcox  
Nuclear Power Generation Division  
Suite 525, 1700 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, Maryland 20852

President, Board of  
County Commissioners of  
Ottawa County  
Port Clinton, Ohio 43452

Resident Inspector  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
5503 N. State Route 2  
Oak Harbor, Ohio 43449

State of Ohio  
Public Utilities Commission  
180 East Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0573



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

TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

AND

THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-346

DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 109  
License No. NPF-3

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
  - A. The application for amendment by the Toledo Edison Company and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (the licensees) dated January 22, 1986, as clarified August 25, 1987, December 28, 1987, January 15, 1988 and February 17, 1988 complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
  - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
  - C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;
  - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
  - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

8803180257 880309  
PDR ADDCK 05000346  
P PDR

2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. NPF-3 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 109, are hereby incorporated in the license. The Toledo Edison Company shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented not later than May 9, 1988.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



for

Kenneth E. Perkins, Director  
Project Directorate III-3  
Division of Reactor Projects - III,  
IV, V and Special Projects

Attachment:  
Changes to the Technical  
Specifications

Date of Issuance: March 9, 1988

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 109

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-3

DOCKET NO. 50-346

Replace the following pages of the Appendix "A" Technical Specifications with the attached pages. The revised pages are identified by Amendment number and contain vertical lines indicating the area of change. The corresponding overleaf page(s) are also provided to maintain document completeness.

Remove

3/4 6-18  
6-6  
6-7  
6-8  
6-12  
--  
6-13  
6-14

Insert

3/4 6-18  
6-6  
6-7  
6-8  
6-12  
6-12a  
6-13  
6-14

TABLE 3.6-2  
CONTAINMENT ISOLATION VALVES (Continued)

<u>PENETRATION VALVE NUMBER</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>FUNCTION</u>	<u>ISOLATION TIME (seconds)</u>
16	RC1719A	Containment Vessel Vent Header	10
16	RC1719B	Containment Vessel Vent Header	10
18 #	SS598	Steam Generator Secondary Water Sample Line	10
19	MU33	Normal RCS Makeup Line	10
19 #	HP2A	High Pressure Injection Line	15
20 #	HP2B	High Pressure Injection Line	15
21	DW6831A	Demineralized Water Supply Line	10
21	DW6831B	Demineralized Water Supply Line	10
22 #	HP2D	High Pressure Injection Line	15
25	CS1531	Containment Spray Line	35
26	CS1530	Containment Spray Line	35
30 #	DH9A	Containment Sump Emergency Recirc Line	71
31 #	DH9B	Containment Sump Emergency Recirc Line	71
32	RC1773A	RCS Drain to RC Drain Tank	10
32	RC1773B	RCS Drain to RC Drain Tank	10
37 #	FW601	Main Feedwater Line	15
38 #	FW612	Main Feedwater Line	15
**39 #	MS100	Main Steam Line	5
**39 #	ICS11A	Main Steam Line	10
39 #	MS375	Main Steam Line	10
39 #	MS100-1	Main Steam Line	10
**40 #	MS101	Main Steam Line	5
**40 #	ICS11B	Main Steam Line	10
40 #	MS394	Main Steam Line	10
40 #	MS101-1	Main Steam Line	10

TABLE 3.6-2

## CONTAINMENT ISOLATION VALVES (Continued)

<u>PENETRATION NUMBER</u>	<u>VALVE NUMBER</u>	<u>FUNCTION</u>	<u>ISOLATION TIME (seconds)</u>
41	RC232	Pressurizer Quench Tank Circulating Inlet Line	10
42A	SA2010	Service Air Supply Line	10
42B	CV5010E	Containment Vessel Air Sample Return	15
43A	IA2011	Instrument Air Supply Line	10
43B	CV5011E	Containment Vessel Air Sample Return	15
44A	CF1541	Core Flood Tank Fill and N2 Supply Line	10
44B	NN236	Pressurizer Quench Tank N2 Supply Line	10
47A	CV1545	Core Flood Tank Sample Line	10
47B	CV1542	Core Flood Tank Vent Line	10
48	RC229A	Pressurizer Quench Tank Circulating Outlet Line	10
48	RC229B	Pressurizer Quench Tank Circulating Outlet Line	10
50 #	HP2C	High Pressure Injection Line	15
51	CV5037	Hydrogen Purge System Exhaust Line	60
51	CV5038	Hydrogen Purge System Exhaust Line	60
52	MU66A	Reactor Coolant Pump Seal Supply	12
53	MU66B	Reactor Coolant Pump Seal Supply	12
54	MU66C	Reactor Coolant Pump Seal Supply	12
55	MU66D	Reactor Coolant Pump Seal Supply	12
56	MU38	Reactor Coolant Pump Seal Return	12
56	MU59A	Reactor Coolant Pump Seal Return	30
56	MU59B	Reactor Coolant Pump Seal Return	30
56	MU59C	Reactor Coolant Pump Seal Return	30
56	MU59D	Reactor Coolant Pump Seal Return	30
57 #	MS603	Steam Generator Blowdown Line	80
60 #	MS611	Steam Generator Blowdown Line	80

## ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

---

### 6.3 FACILITY STAFF QUALIFICATIONS

6.3.1 Each member of the facility staff shall meet or exceed the minimum qualifications of ANSI N18.1-1971 for comparable positions, except for (1) the Chemistry and Health Physics General Superintendent who shall meet or exceed the qualifications of Regulatory Guide 1.8, September 1975 and (2) the Shift Technical Advisor who shall have a bachelor's degree or equivalent in a scientific or engineering discipline with specific training in plant design, and response and analysis of the plant for transients and accidents.

### 6.4 TRAINING

6.4.1 A retraining and replacement training program for the facility staff shall be maintained under the direction of the Nuclear Training Director and shall meet or exceed the requirements and recommendations of Section 5.5 of ANSI N18.1-1971 and Appendix "A" of 10 CFR Part 55.

6.4.2 A training program for the Fire Brigade shall be maintained under the direction of the Fire Marshall and shall meet or exceed the requirements of Section 27 of the NFPA Code-1976.

### 6.5 REVIEW AND AUDIT

#### 6.5.1 STATION REVIEW BOARD (SRB)

##### FUNCTION

6.5.1.1 The Station Review Board (SRB) shall function to advise the Plant Manager on all matters related to nuclear safety.

## ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

### COMPOSITION

6.5.1.2 The Station Review Board shall be composed of the:

Chairman:	Station Review Board Chairman*
Member:	Assistant Plant Manager, Operations
Member:	Assistant Plant Manager, Maintenance
Member:	Technical Support Manager
Member:	Chemistry and Health Physics General Superintendent
Member:	Operations Engineering Supervisor (Plant)
Member:	An Engineering Director or Performance Engineering Manager
Member:	Operations Quality Assurance Manager
Member:	Operations Superintendent (Plant)

\* Designated in writing by the Plant Manager. The Chairman will be drawn from SRB members.

### ALTERNATES

6.5.1.3 All alternate members shall be appointed in writing by the SRB Chairman; however, no more than two alternates shall participate as voting members in SRB activities at any one time.

### MEETING FREQUENCY

6.5.1.4 The SRB shall meet at least once per calendar month and as convened by the SRB Chairman or his designated alternate.

### QUORUM

6.5.1.5 A quorum of the SRB shall consist of the Chairman or his designated alternate and four members including alternates.

### RESPONSIBILITIES

6.5.1.6 The Station Review Board shall be responsible for:

- a. Review of plant administrative procedures and changes thereto.
- b. Review of the safety evaluation for 1) procedures, 2) changes to procedures, equipment or systems and 3) tests or experiments completed under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59, to verify that such actions do not constitute an unreviewed safety question.
- c. Review of proposed procedures and changes to procedures and equipment determined to involve an unreviewed safety question as defined in 10 CFR 50.59.

## ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

---

- d. Review of proposed tests or experiments determined to involve an unreviewed safety question as defined in 10 CFR 50.59.
- e. Investigation of all violations of the Technical Specifications including preparation and forwarding of reports covering evaluation and recommendations to prevent recurrence to the Vice President, Nuclear and to the Chairman of the Company Nuclear Review Board.
- f. Review of all proposed changes to the Technical Specifications or the Operating License.
- g. Review of reports of violations of codes, regulations, orders or Operating License requirements having nuclear safety significance.
- h. Review of reports of significant operating abnormalities or deviations from normal and expected performance of plant equipment that affect plant safety.
- i. Review of the Plant Security Plan and changes thereto.
- j. Review of the Emergency Plan and changes thereto.
- k. Review of items which may constitute potential nuclear safety hazards as identified during review of facility operations.
- l. Investigations or analyses of special subjects as requested by the Company Nuclear Review Board.
- m. Review of all REPORTABLE EVENTS.
- n. Review of all Safety Limit Violation Reports (Section 6.7).
- o. Review of any unplanned, accidental or uncontrolled radioactive releases, evaluation of the event, ensurance that remedial action is identified to prevent recurrence, review of a report covering the evaluation and forwarding of the report to the Plant Manager and to the CNRB.
- p. Review of the OFFSITE DOSE CALCULATION MANUAL and implementation of procedures at least once per 24 months.
- q. Review of the PROCESS CONTROL PROGRAM and implementation of procedures for processing and packaging of radioactive wastes at least once per 24 months.
- r. Review of the Annual Radiological Environmental Operating Report.
- s. Review of the Semiannual Radioactive Effluent Release Report.

## ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

### AUTHORITY

- 6.5.1.7 The Station Review Board shall:
- a. Recommend to the Plant Manager written approval or disapproval of items considered under Sections 6.5.1.6 a, c, d, f, i and j.
  - b. Render determinations in writing with regard to whether or not each item considered under Sections 6.5.1.6 a, c, d and f above constitutes an unreviewed safety question as defined in 10 CFR 50.59.
  - c. Provide written notification within 24 hours to the Vice President, Nuclear and the Company Nuclear Review Board of disagreement between the SRB and the Plant Manager; however, the Plant Manager shall have responsibility for resolution of such disagreements pursuant to 6.1.1 above.
  - d. Make recommendations in writing to the Plant Manager that actions reviewed under Section 6.5.1.6 b above do not constitute an unreviewed safety question.

### RECORDS

6.5.1.8 The Station Review Board shall maintain written minutes of each meeting and copies shall be provided to the Plant Manager, Vice President, Nuclear and Chairman of the Company Nuclear Review Board.

### 6.5.2 COMPANY NUCLEAR REVIEW BOARD (CNRB)

#### FUNCTION

6.5.2.1 The Company Nuclear Review Board (CNRB) shall function to provide independent review and audit of designated activities in the areas of:

- a. Nuclear power plant operations,
- b. Nuclear engineering,
- c. Chemistry and radiochemistry,
- d. Metallurgy,
- e. Instrumentation and control,
- f. Radiological safety,
- g. Mechanical and electrical engineering, and
- h. Quality assurance practices.

## ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

---

### AUDITS

6.5.2.8 Audits of facility activities shall be performed under the cognizance of the CNRB. These audits shall encompass:

- a. The conformance of unit operation to provisions contained within the Technical Specifications and applicable license conditions at least once per 12 months.
- b. The performance, training and qualifications of the entire station staff at least once per 12 months.
- c. The results of actions taken to correct deficiencies occurring in unit equipment, structures, systems or method of operation that affect nuclear safety at least once per 6 months.
- d. The performance of activities required by the Quality Assurance Program to meet the criteria of Appendix "B", 10 CFR 50, at least once per 24 months.
- e. The Station Emergency Plan and implementing procedures at least once per 12 months.
- f. The Station Security Plan and implementing procedures at least once per 12 months.
- g. Any other area of facility operation considered appropriate by the CNRB.
- h. The Facility Fire Protection Program and implementing procedures at least once per 24 months.
- i. An independent fire protection and loss prevention program inspection and audit shall be performed at least once per 12 months utilizing either qualified offsite licensee personnel or an outside fire protection firm.
- j. An inspection and audit of the fire protection and loss prevention program shall be performed by a qualified outside fire consultant at least once per 36 months.
- k. The performance of activities required by the Quality Assurance Program to meet the provisions of Regulatory Guide 1.21, Revision 1, June 1974 and Regulatory Guide 4.1, Revision 1, April 1975 at least once per 12 months.

## ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

### AUTHORITY

6.5.2.9 The Company Nuclear Review Board shall report to and advise the Vice President, Nuclear, on those areas of responsibility specified in Sections 6.5.2.7 and 6.5.2.8.

### RECORDS

6.5.2.10 Records of Company Nuclear Review Board activities shall be prepared, approved and distributed as indicated below:

- a. Minutes of each CNRB meeting shall be prepared, approved and forwarded to the Vice President, Nuclear and CNRB members within 14 days following each meeting.
- b. Reports of reviews encompassed by Section 6.5.2.7 above, shall be prepared, approved and forwarded to the Vice President, Nuclear and CNRB members within 14 days following completion of the review.
- c. Audit reports encompassed by Section 6.5.2.8 above, shall be forwarded to the Vice President, Nuclear and CNRB members and to the management positions responsible for the areas audited within 30 days after completion of the audit.

## 6.5.3 TECHNICAL REVIEW AND CONTROL

### ACTIVITIES

6.5.3.1 Activities which affect nuclear safety shall be conducted as follows:

- a. Plant procedures required by Section 6.8.1 and changes thereto shall be prepared, reviewed and approved. Each such procedure or procedure change shall be reviewed by an individual/group other than the individual/group which prepared the procedure or procedure change, but who may be from the same organization as the individual/group which prepared the procedure or procedure change. Plant procedures other than plant administrative procedures will be approved as delineated in writing by individuals holding positions not lower than one management level below the Plant Manager. The Plant Manager will approve plant administrative procedures, Security Implementing Plant Procedures and Emergency Implementing Plant Procedures.
- b. Temporary approval of changes to plant procedures cited in Section 6.8.1 which clearly do not change the intent of the approved procedures, can be made by two members of the plant management staff, at least one of whom holds a Senior Reactor Operator's License. For changes to plant procedures, which may

## ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

involve a change in intent of the approved procedures, the person authorized in Section 6.5.3.1a to approve the procedure shall approve the change.

- c. Proposed changes or modifications to plant structures, systems and components shall be reviewed as designated by the Plant Manager. Each such modification shall be reviewed by an individual/group other than the individual/group which designed the modification, but who may be from the same organization as the individual/group which designed the modifications. Implementation of modifications to plant structures, systems and components shall be approved by the Plant Manager.
- d. Proposed tests and experiments which affect plant nuclear safety and are not addressed in the Safety Analysis Report shall be reviewed by an individual/group other than the individual/group which prepared the proposed test or experiment and approved by the Plant Manager.
- e. Individuals responsible for reviews performed in accordance with Section 6.5.3.1 a, b, c and d above shall meet or exceed the appropriate qualification requirements of Section 4.2, 4.3.1, 4.4 or 4.6 of ANSI 18.1, 1971, and be previously designated by the Plant Manager. Each such review shall include a determination of whether an additional, cross disciplinary, review is necessary. If deemed necessary, such review shall be performed by the review personnel of the appropriate discipline.
- f. Each review will include a determination of whether an unreviewed safety question is involved as defined in 10 CFR 50.59.

### 6.6 REPORTABLE EVENT ACTION

6.6.1 The following actions shall be taken for REPORTABLE EVENTS:

- a. The Commission shall be notified and/or a report submitted pursuant to the requirements of SECTION 50.73 to 10 CFR PART 50, and
- b. Each REPORTABLE EVENT shall be reviewed by the SRB, and the results of this review shall be submitted to the CNRB and the Vice President, Nuclear.

## ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

---

### 6.7 SAFETY LIMIT VIOLATION

6.7.1 The following actions shall be taken in the event a Safety Limit is violated:

- a. The facility shall be placed in at least HOT STANDBY within one hour.
- b. The Safety Limit violation shall be reported to the NRC Operations Center by telephone as soon as possible and in all cases within one hour. In addition the Vice President, Nuclear and the CNRB shall be notified within 24 hours.
- c. A Safety Limit Violation Report shall be prepared. The report shall be reviewed by the SRB. This report shall describe (1) applicable circumstances preceding the violation, (2) effects of the violation upon facility components, systems or structures, and (3) corrective action taken to prevent recurrence.
- d. The Safety Limit Violation Report shall be submitted to the Commission, the CNRB and the Vice President, Nuclear within 14 days of the violation.

### 6.8 PROCEDURES AND PROGRAMS

6.8.1 Written procedures shall be established, implemented and maintained covering the activities referenced below:

- a. The applicable procedures recommended in Appendix "A" of Regulatory Guide 1.33, November, 1972.
- b. Refueling operations.
- c. Surveillance and test activities of safety related equipment.
- d. Security Plan implementation.
- e. Emergency Plan implementation.
- f. Fire Protection Program implementation.
- g. The radiological environmental monitoring program.
- h. The Process Control Program.
- i. Offsite Dose Calculation Manual implementation.

6.8.2 Each procedure of 6.8.1 above, and changes thereto, shall be reviewed and approved prior to implementation as set forth in 6.5.3 above.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

---

6.8.3 (deleted)

6.8.4 The following programs shall be established, implemented and maintained:

a. Primary Coolant Sources Outside Containment

A program to reduce leakage from those portions of systems outside containment that could contain highly radioactive fluids during a serious transient or accident to as low as practical levels. The systems include makeup, letdown, seal injection, seal return, low pressure injection, containment spray, high pressure injection, waste gas, primary sampling and reactor coolant drain systems. The program shall include the following:

- (i) Preventive maintenance and/or periodic visual inspection requirements, and
- (ii) Integrated leak test requirements for each system at refueling cycle intervals or less.

b. In-Plant Radiation Monitoring

A program which will ensure the capability to accurately determine the airborne iodine concentration in vital areas under accident conditions. This program shall include the following:

- (i) Training of personnel,
- (ii) Procedures for monitoring, and
- (iii) Provisions for maintenance of sampling and analysis equipment.



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 109 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-3

TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

AND

THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY

DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-346

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated January 22, 1986, as clarified by letters dated August 25 and December 28, 1987, January 15, 1988, and February 17, 1988, Toledo Edison Company (TED or the licensee) submitted an application for amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-3 for the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1. The application proposed certain revisions to the Technical Specifications (TS's) which would revise and clarify the duties and responsibilities of the Station Review Board (SRB). This would be accomplished by adding a new Section 6.5.3 which would specify how activities affecting nuclear safety should be conducted and by revising Sections 6.5.1.6 and 6.5.1.7 which would identify SRB responsibilities and SRB authority, respectively. Additionally, Section 6.8.2 would be modified and Section 6.8.3 would be deleted to eliminate material which would be included in the new Section 6.5.3 and modified Sections 6.5.1 and 6.5.1.7.

In addition to these proposed changes, the licensee also proposed deletion of an undefined term in Section 6.5.1.3 and a number of position title changes in various sections. With regard to the position title changes, the Commission issued Amendment No. 98 (February 18, 1987) which approved the proposed title changes.

2.0 EVALUATION

The licensee proposed that a new Section 6.5.3, "Technical Review and Control," be added to provide for technical review of changes to procedures and facilities and for the review of tests or experiments not covered in the Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR) which affect the nuclear safety of the Davis-Besse facility. The new section would specify that procedures and facility changes or tests/experiments be reviewed by an individual or group different from the one which prepared the change or test. The new section would also specify that the individuals designated by the Plant Manager to perform the reviews must meet the qualification requirements of Sections 4.2, 4.3.1, 4.4 or 4.6 of ANSI Standard 18.1, 1971. Each review will include a determination of whether an unreviewed safety question as defined in 10 CFR 50.59 is involved. The new section would also provide for inter-disciplinary reviews when such reviews are deemed necessary.

8803180260 880309  
PDR ADDCK 05000346  
P PDR

The specification for temporary approval of changes to procedures, presently in TS Section 6.8.3, would be moved to this new Section 6.5.3 and reworded, but the approval authority would remain as before for changes which do not change the intent of the procedure. The proposed section would delete the specific requirement for SRB review of such changes. The licensee has stated that final review and approval by the SRB and Plant Manager is required within 14 days by station procedure.

The NRC staff has reviewed this new section and finds that it meets the requirements for independent reviews of facility changes of ANSI Standard N45.2.11-1974, Section 6, Design Verification, which is endorsed by the Commission in Regulatory Guide 1.64 and is committed to in the Toledo Edison Nuclear Quality Assurance Program. The same independent reviews of procedures and changes thereto, and of tests and experiments would also enhance the assurance of safety in these areas. The staff, therefore, finds this new section on technical review and control to be acceptable, on the condition that station procedures requiring final SRB review and approval within 14 days for temporary approvals to procedures are maintained in force.

The licensee also proposed to modify the responsibilities (Section 6.5.1.6) of the SRB and authority (Section 6.5.1.7) to bring them into agreement with the new Section 6.5.3. This would eliminate the SRB review of the strictly technical content of the proposed changes, but would retain SRB review of the safety related aspects of the change, including any unreviewed safety question determined during the technical review or during the SRB review. For changes where an unreviewed safety question exists, the SRB would perform a technical review as well as a safety review. The staff has reviewed these proposed changes and has found that the licensee's proposed deletion of existing item e of Section 6.5.1.6 is not acceptable, however, the remaining proposed changes to Section 6.5.1.6 are found to be acceptable. Therefore, the following changes are approved for incorporation into the TS's.

- Replacement of existing items a through d with the licensee's proposed items a through d.
- Deletion of existing items f through j and replacement with the licensee's proposed items e through i (but relettered f through j).
- The licensee's proposed item f is modified to delete a redundant reference to Technical Specifications because this specific requirement is retained in item e.
- Incorporation of proposed items j through m (but relettered k through n).
- Relettering of existing items k through o as items o through s.
- Modification of Section 6.8.2 relating to changes to procedures to delete the specification of review and approval requirements (which are now included in the new Section 6.5.3) and add reference to the requirements of Section 6.5.3.

-Deletion of Section 6.8.3 dealing with changes and approvals to temporary procedure changes, since these requirements are specified in new Section 6.5.3.

The licensee proposed modifications to Sections 6.5.1.7.a and 6.5.1.7.b to be consistent with the revised responsibilities proposed in Section 6.5.1.6. The staff finds the licensee's proposed changes acceptable except that, consistent with the staff's denial to delete item 6.5.1.6.e, that item is retained in Section 6.5.1.7.b. (The licensee's proposal is also relettered to be consistent with the relettering of the items in Section 6.5.1.6.)

The licensee proposed to add an additional SRB Authority. Specifically, the SRB would recommend to the Plant Manager that an action reviewed under Section 6.5.1.6.b does not constitute an unreviewed safety question. The staff finds the additional requirement acceptable.

The licensee proposed to delete the undefined phrase "to serve on a temporary basis" from Section 6.5.1.3. The staff finds the deletion acceptable.

The staff has compared the licensee's proposed changes to the acceptance criteria set forth in Section 13.4 of the Standard Review Plan (NUREG-0800) and finds that the proposed changes are consistent with those criteria. These changes are similar to changes previously approved by the staff for other facility TS's.

The denial to delete item e, Section 6.5.1.6, by the staff is based upon the concern that there should be adequate assurance that the results of investigations of Technical Specification violations are brought to the attention of responsible corporate management. The licensee's proposal to delete this requirement would be inconsistent with TS's recently approved for other facilities by the NRC and is inconsistent with current Standard Technical Specifications.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment relates to changes in recordkeeping, reporting, or administrative procedures or requirements. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(10). 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.

### 4.0 CONCLUSION

The staff has 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.

Principal Contributors: D. S. Butler, A. W. De Agazio

Dated: March 9, 1988

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONTOLEDO EDISON COMPANYANDTHE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANYDAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1DOCKET NO. 50-346NOTICE OF DENIAL OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATINGLICENSE AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has denied, in part, a request by the Toledo Edison Company for an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-3, issued to Toledo Edison Company and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (the licensees), for operation of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, located in Ottawa County, Ohio. Notice of consideration of issuance of this amendment was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on July 2, 1986 (51 FR 24265).

The proposed amendment, in part, would delete the requirement specified in Technical Specification 6.5.1.6.e concerning Station Review Board responsibility to investigate and report Technical Specification (TS) violations. The Commission has determined that this TS provides assurance that the results of investigations of TS violations are brought to the attention of responsible corporate management and, therefore, should not be deleted.

All other provisions of the amendment request have been approved by Amendment No. 109 dated March 9, 1988. Notice of Issuance of Amendment No. 109 will be published in the Commission's biweekly FEDERAL REGISTER notice.

8803180273 880309  
PDR ADOCK 05000346  
P PDR

Toledo Edison Company was notified of the Commission's denial of the proposed TS change by letter dated March 9, 1988.

By **APR 15 1988**, the licensees may demand a hearing with respect to the denial described above and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding may file a written petition for leave to intervene.

A request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., by the above date.

A copy of any petitions should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel/Rockville, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, and to Gerald Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037, attorney for the licensees.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment dated January 22, 1986, as clarified August 25 and December 28, 1987, and January 15 and February 17, 1988, (2) the Commission's letter to Toledo Edison Company dated March 9, 1988, and (3) the Commission's Safety Evaluation issued with Amendment No. 109 to NPF-3 dated March 9, 1988, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and at the University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio. A copy of items (2)

(2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Reactor Projects - III, IV, V and Special Projects.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of March , 1988.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Albert W. De Agazio, Project Manager  
Project Directorate III-3  
Division of Reactor Projects - III, IV, V  
& Special Projects