

February 10, 1997

Distribution w/encls:

Mr. John K. Wood  
Vice President - Nuclear, Davis-Besse  
Centerior Service Company  
c/o Toledo Edison  
Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station  
5501 North State Route 2  
Oak Harbor, Ohio 43449-9760

Docket File GHill (2)  
PUBLIC CGrimes  
PD3-3 Reading ACRS  
JCaldwell, RIII OGC  
JRoe GMarcus  
LGundrum

SUBJECT: AMENDMENT NO. 213 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-3 -  
DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1 (TAC NO. M96344)

Dear Mr. Wood:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 213 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-3 for the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station (DBNPS), Unit No. 1. The amendment revises the Technical Specifications in response to your application dated August 7, 1996.

This amendment revises Technical Specification (TS) 1.0, "Definitions," by defining a refueling interval to be  $\leq$  730 days; and revises TS 3/4.0, "Applicability," TS 3/4.6.2.1, "Containment Systems - Depressurization and Cooling Systems - Containment Spray System," and TS 3/4.6.3.1, "Containment Systems - Containment Isolation Valves," to reflect performing surveillance tests during a refueling interval rather than every 18 months.

A copy of the Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. Notice of issuance will be included in the Commission's next biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,  
Original Signed by  
Allen G. Hansen, Project Manager  
Project Directorate III-3  
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-346

- Enclosures: 1. Amendment No. 213 to License No. NPF-3  
2. Safety Evaluation

**NRC FILE CENTER COPY**

cc w/encls: See next page

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\DAVISBES\DB96344.AMD

\* See previous concurrence

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

OFFICE	PD33-LA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PD33-PM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCSB-BC	<input type="checkbox"/>	OGC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
NAME	EBarnhill	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AHansen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CBerlinger *	<input type="checkbox"/>	ERHOLLER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DATE	02/04/97	<input type="checkbox"/>	2/6/97	<input type="checkbox"/>	1/23/97	<input type="checkbox"/>	2/7/97	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

9702200340 970210  
PDR ADOCK 05000346  
P PDR

1/1  
DFC/1

February 10, 1997

Distribution w/encls:

Mr. John K. Wood  
Vice President - Nuclear, Davis-Besse  
Centerior Service Company  
c/o Toledo Edison  
Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station  
5501 North State Route 2  
Oak Harbor, Ohio 43449-9760

Docket File GHill (2)  
PUBLIC CGrimes  
PD3-3 Reading ACRS  
JCaldwell, RIII OGC  
JRoe GMarcus  
LGundrum

SUBJECT: AMENDMENT NO. 213 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-3 -  
DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1 (TAC NO. M96344)

Dear Mr. Wood:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 213 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-3 for the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station (DBNPS), Unit No. 1. The amendment revises the Technical Specifications in response to your application dated August 7, 1996.

This amendment revises Technical Specification (TS) 1.0, "Definitions," by defining a refueling interval to be  $\leq 730$  days; and revises TS 3/4.0, "Applicability," TS 3/4.6.2.1, "Containment Systems - Depressurization and Cooling Systems - Containment Spray System," and TS 3/4.6.3.1, "Containment Systems - Containment Isolation Valves," to reflect performing surveillance tests during a refueling interval rather than every 18 months.

A copy of the Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. Notice of issuance will be included in the Commission's next biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,  
Original Signed by  
Allen G. Hansen, Project Manager  
Project Directorate III-3  
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-346

Enclosures: 1. Amendment No. 213 to  
License No. NPF-3  
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\DAVISBES\DB96344.AMD

\* See previous concurrence

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

OFFICE	PD33-LA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PD33-PM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCSB-BC	<input type="checkbox"/>	OGC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
NAME	EBarnhill <i>EB</i>		AHansen <i>AH</i>		CBerlinger *		<i>ERHOLLER</i>			
DATE	02/04/97		2/6/97		1/23/97		2/2/97			

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

February 10, 1997

Mr. John K. Wood  
Vice President - Nuclear, Davis-Besse  
Centerior Service Company  
c/o Toledo Edison Company  
Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station  
5501 North State Route 2  
Oak Harbor, OH 43449-9760

SUBJECT: AMENDMENT NO. 213 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-3 -  
DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1 (TAC NO. M96344)

Dear Mr. Wood:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 213 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-3 for the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station (DBNPS), Unit No. 1. The amendment revises the Technical Specifications in response to your application dated August 7, 1996.

This amendment revises Technical Specification (TS) 1.0, "Definitions," by defining a refueling interval to be  $\leq 730$  days; and revises TS 3/4.0, "Applicability," TS 3/4.6.2.1, "Containment Systems - Depressurization and Cooling Systems - Containment Spray System," and TS 3/4.6.3.1, "Containment Systems - Containment Isolation Valves," to reflect performing surveillance tests during a refueling interval rather than every 18 months.

A copy of the Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. Notice of issuance will be included in the Commission's next biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Allen G. Hansen".

Allen G. Hansen, Project Manager  
Project Directorate III-3  
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-346

Enclosures: 1. Amendment No. 213 to  
License No. NPF-3  
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

Mr. John K. Wood  
Toledo Edison Company

cc:  
Mary E. O'Reilly  
Centerior Energy Corporation  
300 Madison Avenue  
Toledo, Ohio 43652

Mr. James L. Freels  
Manager - Regulatory Affairs  
Toledo Edison Company  
Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station  
5501 North State - Route 2  
Oak Harbor, Ohio 43449-9760

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

Regional Administrator  
U.S. NRC, Region III  
801 Warrenville Road  
Lisle, Illinois 60523-4351

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

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

Mr. James H. Lash, Plant Manager  
Toledo Edison Company  
Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station  
5501 North State Route 2  
Oak Harbor, Ohio 43449-9760

Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station  
Unit No. 1

Robert E. Owen, Chief  
Bureau of Radiological Health  
Service  
Ohio Department of Health  
P. O. Box 118  
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0118

Attorney General  
Department of Attorney  
30 East Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Mr. James W. Harris, Director  
Division of Power Generation  
Ohio Department of Industrial  
Regulations  
P. O. Box 825  
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency  
DERR--Compliance Unit  
ATTN: Zack A. Clayton  
P. O. Box 1049  
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0149

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

Mr. James R. Williams  
Chief of Staff  
Ohio Emergency Management Agency  
2855 West Dublin Granville Road  
Columbus, Ohio 43235-2206

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



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

CENTERIOR SERVICE 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. 213  
License No. NPF-3

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
  - A. The application for amendment by the Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company, and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (the licensees) dated August 7, 1996, 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.
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:

9702200347 970210  
PDR ADOCK 05000346  
P PDR

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 213, 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 no later than 120 days after issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Allen G. Hansen, Project Manager  
Project Directorate III-3  
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment: Changes to the Technical  
Specifications

Date of issuance: February 10, 1997

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 213

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.

Remove

1-6b

3/4 6-11

3/4 6-15

B 3/4 0-2

B 3/4 0-3

B 3/4 0-4

Insert

1-6b

3/4 6-11

3/4 6-15

B 3/4 0-2

B 3/4 0-3

B 3/4 0-4

## DEFINITIONS

---

### UNRESTRICTED AREA

1.39 An UNRESTRICTED AREA shall be any area at or beyond the SITE BOUNDARY access to which is not controlled by the licensee for purposes of protection of individuals from exposure to radiation and radioactive materials, or any area within the SITE BOUNDARY used for residential quarters or for industrial, commercial, institutional, and/or recreational purposes. The definition of UNRESTRICTED AREA used in implementing the Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications has been expanded over that in 10 CFR 20.3(a)(17). The UNRESTRICTED AREA boundary may coincide with the exclusion (fenced) area boundary, as defined in 10 CFR 100.3(a), but the UNRESTRICTED AREA does not include areas over water bodies. The concept of UNRESTRICTED AREAS, established at or beyond the SITE BOUNDARY, is utilized in the LIMITING CONDITIONS FOR OPERATION to keep levels of radioactive materials in liquid and gaseous effluents as low as is reasonably achievable, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.36a.

1.40 Deleted

### CORE OPERATING LIMITS REPORT

1.41 The CORE OPERATING LIMITS REPORT is the unit-specific document that provides core operating limits for the current reload cycle. These cycle-specific core operating limits shall be determined for each reload cycle in accordance with Specification 6.9.1.7. Plant operation within these core operating limits is addressed in individual specifications.

### REFUELING INTERVAL

1.42 A REFUELING INTERVAL is a period of time  $\leq$  730 days.

## CONTAINMENT SYSTEMS

### 3/4.6.2 DEPRESSURIZATION AND COOLING SYSTEMS

#### CONTAINMENT SPRAY SYSTEM

##### LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION

---

3.6.2.1 Two independent containment spray systems shall be OPERABLE with each spray system capable of taking suction from the BWST on a containment spray actuation signal and manually transferring suction to the containment emergency sump during the recirculation phase of operation.

APPLICABILITY: MODES 1, 2, 3 and 4.

##### ACTION:

With one containment spray system inoperable, restore the inoperable spray system to OPERABLE status within 72 hours or be in at least HOT STANDBY within the next 6 hours; restore the inoperable spray system to OPERABLE status within the next 48 hours or be in COLD SHUTDOWN within the next 30 hours.

##### SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

---

4.6.2.1 Each containment spray system shall be demonstrated OPERABLE:

- a. At least once per 31 days by verifying that each valve (manual, power operated or automatic) in the flow path that is not locked, sealed or otherwise secured in position, is in its correct position.
- b. At least once each REFUELING INTERVAL, by:
  1. Verifying that each automatic valve in the flow path actuates to its correct position on a containment spray test signal.
  2. Verifying that each spray pump starts automatically on a SFAS test signal.

CONTAINMENT SYSTEMS

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

---

4.6.3.1.2 Each isolation valve shall be demonstrated OPERABLE at least once each REFUELING INTERVAL, by:

- a. Verifying that on a containment isolation test signal, each automatic isolation valve actuates to its isolation position.
- b. Verifying that on a Containment Purge and Exhaust isolation test signal, each Purge and Exhaust automatic valve actuates to its isolation position.

4.6.3.1.3 The isolation time of each power operated or automatic valve shall be determined to be within its limit when tested pursuant to Specification 4.0.5.

## APPLICABILITY

### BASES

---

4.0.1 This specification provides that surveillance activities necessary to insure the Limiting Conditions for Operation are met and will be performed during the OPERATIONAL MODES or other conditions for which the Limiting Conditions for Operation are applicable. Provisions for additional surveillance activities to be performed without regard to the applicable OPERATIONAL MODES or other conditions are provided in the individual Surveillance Requirements.

4.0.2 The provisions of this specification provide allowable tolerances for performing surveillance activities beyond those specified in the nominal surveillance interval. These tolerances are necessary to provide operational flexibility because of scheduling and performance considerations. The phrase "at least" associated with a surveillance frequency does not negate this allowable tolerance value and permits the performance of more frequent surveillance activities.

The allowable tolerance for performing surveillance activities is sufficiently restrictive to ensure that the reliability associated with the surveillance activity is not significantly degraded beyond that obtained from the nominal specified interval. It is not intended that the allowable tolerance be used as a convenience to repeatedly schedule the performance of surveillances at the allowable tolerance limit.

The allowable tolerance for performing surveillance activities also provides flexibility to accommodate the length of a fuel cycle for surveillances that are specified to be performed at least once each REFUELING INTERVAL. It is the intent that REFUELING INTERVAL surveillances be performed in an OPERATIONAL MODE consistent with safe plant operation.

4.0.3 This specification establishes the failure to perform a Surveillance Requirement within the allowed surveillance interval, defined by the provisions of Specification 4.0.2, as a condition that constitutes a failure to meet the OPERABILITY requirements for a Limiting Condition for Operation. Under the provisions of this specification, systems and components are assumed to be OPERABLE when Surveillance Requirements have been satisfactorily performed within the specified time interval. However, nothing in this provision is to be construed as implying that systems or components are OPERABLE when they are found or known to be inoperable although still meeting the Surveillance Requirements. This specification also clarifies that the ACTION requirements are applicable when Surveillance Requirements have not been completed within the allowed surveillance interval and that the time limits of the ACTION requirements apply from the point in time it is identified that a surveillance has not been performed and not at the time that the allowed surveillance inter-

## APPLICABILITY

### BASES

val was exceeded. Completion of the Surveillance Requirement within the allowable (equipment inoperability) outage time limits of the ACTION requirements restores compliance with the requirements of Specification 4.0.3. However, this does not negate the fact that the failure to have performed the surveillance within the allowed surveillance interval, defined by the provisions of Specification 4.0.2, was a violation of the OPERABILITY requirements of a Limiting Condition for Operation that is subject to enforcement action. Further, the failure to perform a surveillance within the provisions of Specification 4.0.2 is a violation of a Technical Specification requirement and is, therefore, a reportable event under the requirements of 10 CFR 50.73(a)(2)(i)(B) because it is a condition prohibited by the plant's Technical Specifications.

If the allowable (equipment inoperability) outage time limits of the ACTION requirements are less than 24 hours or a shutdown is required to comply with ACTION requirements, e.g., Specification 3.0.3, a 24-hour allowance is provided to permit a delay in implementing the ACTION requirements. This provides an adequate time limit to complete Surveillance Requirements that have not been performed. The purpose of this allowance is to permit the completion of a surveillance before a shutdown is required to comply with ACTION requirements or before other remedial measures would be required that may preclude completion of a surveillance. The basis for this allowance includes consideration for plant conditions, adequate planning, availability of personnel, the time required to perform the surveillance, and the safety significance of the delay in completing the required surveillance. If a surveillance is not completed within the 24-hour allowance, the time limits of the ACTION requirements are applicable at that time. When a surveillance is performed within the 24-hour allowance and the Surveillance Requirements are not met, the time limits of the ACTION requirements are applicable at the time that the surveillance is terminated.

Surveillance Requirements do not have to be performed on inoperable equipment because the ACTION requirements define the remedial measures that apply. However, the Surveillance Requirements have to be met to demonstrate that inoperable equipment has been restored to OPERABLE status.

4.0.4 This specification ensures that the surveillance activities associated with a Limiting Condition for Operation have been performed within the specified time interval prior to entry into an OPERATIONAL MODE or other applicable condition. The intent of this provision is to ensure that surveillance activities have been satisfactorily demonstrated on a current basis as required to meet the OPERABILITY requirements of the Limiting Condition for Operation.

Under the terms of this specification, for example, during initial plant startup or following extended plant outages, the applicable surveillance activities must be performed within the stated surveillance interval prior to placing or returning the system or equipment into OPERABLE status.

## APPLICABILITY

### BASES

---

4.0.5 This specification ensures that inservice inspection of ASME Code Class 1, 2 and 3 components and inservice testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2 and 3 pumps and valves will be performed in accordance with a periodically updated version of Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and Addenda as required by 10 CFR 50.55a.

This specification includes a clarification of the frequencies for performing the inservice inspection and testing activities required by Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda. This clarification is provided to ensure consistency in surveillance intervals throughout these Technical Specifications and to remove any ambiguities relative to the frequencies for performing the required inservice inspection and testing activities.

Under the terms of this specification, the more restrictive requirements of the Technical Specifications take precedence over the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda. For example, the requirements of Specification 4.0.4 to perform surveillance activities prior to entry into an OPERATIONAL MODE or other specified applicability condition takes precedence over the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code provision which allows pumps to be tested up to one week after return to normal operation and for example, the Technical Specification definition of OPERABLE does not grant a grace period before a device that is not capable of performing its specified functions is declared inoperable and takes precedence over the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel provision, which allows a valve to be incapable of performing its specified function for up to 24 hours before being declared inoperable.



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 213 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-3

TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

CENTERIOR SERVICE 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 August 7, 1996, Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company, and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (the licensees), submitted a request for changes to the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station (DBNPS), Unit No. 1, Technical Specifications (TS) as a cost beneficial licensing action. The requested amendment would revise TS 1.0, "Definitions," by defining a refueling interval to be  $\leq 730$  days; and would revise TS 3/4.0, "Applicability," TS 3/4.6.2.1, "Containment Systems - Depressurization and Cooling Systems - Containment Spray System," and TS 3/4.6.3.1, "Containment Systems - Containment Isolation Valves," to reflect performing surveillance tests during a refueling interval rather than every 18 months.

2.0 EVALUATION

DBNPS has proposed increasing surveillance intervals from 18 months to  $\leq 730$  days based on an increased fuel cycle. The licensees propose to add a definition of a REFUELING INTERVAL as  $\leq 730$  days in TS 1.0, "Definitions," and change the 18-month interval to REFUELING INTERVAL. The licensees plan to submit the changes to accommodate a longer refueling interval in several submittals to ease preparation and review. These proposed changes are submitted as cost beneficial licensing actions. The first submittal addresses adding the definition of REFUELING INTERVAL, modifies the interval for TS 3/4.6.2.1, "Containment Systems - Depressurization and Cooling Systems - Containment Spray System," TS 3/4.6.3.1, "Containment Systems - Containment Isolation Valves," and adds a change to the TS Bases to address the longer refueling interval.

Generic Letter (GL) 91-04, "Changes In Technical Specification Surveillance Intervals to Accommodate a 24-Month Fuel Cycle," provides guidance on changing TS to accommodate a longer fuel cycle. As discussed in the GL, the TS that specify an 18-month surveillance interval could be changed to state that these surveillances are to be performed once per refueling interval. The GL states

that the notation for surveillance intervals would then be changed to include the definition of a "Refueling Interval" for surveillances that are generally performed during a refueling outage. The GL addresses the provision to extend surveillances by 25 percent of the specified interval to extend the time limit for completing these surveillances from the existing limit of 22.5 months to a maximum of 30 months. Therefore, the proposed changes to add a definition of REFUELING INTERVAL of  $\leq 730$  days and to allow the continued application of TS 4.0.2, which allows surveillance intervals to be increased up to 25% on a non-routine basis (nominally 30 months) is in accordance with the GL. The licensees propose to add a paragraph to Bases 4.0.2, consistent with GL 91-04, that ensures that surveillances are performed consistent with safe plant operation. This TS Bases section already includes clarification that the allowable tolerance not be used as a convenience to repeatedly schedule the performance of surveillances at the allowable tolerance limit. The licensees have not included a proposed change to TS Table 1.2, "Frequency Notation," which currently defines "R" as at least once per 18 months. The "R" notation which is used in the GL to refer to refueling interval will be included in a later amendment request that addresses changes to instrumentation surveillance frequencies.

In addition, the GL requests the licensee to perform an evaluation of each change of surveillance interval. This evaluation entails reviewing the historical maintenance and surveillance test data at the bounding surveillance interval limit, supporting a determination that a 24-month surveillance test interval would not invalidate any assumption in the plant licensing basis, and that the effect on safety is small.

TS Surveillance Requirement (SR) 4.6.2.1.b requires that each Containment Spray System (CSS) shall be demonstrated OPERABLE at least once per 18 months, during shutdown, by performing the activities listed in SR 4.6.2.1.b.1 and SR 4.6.2.1.b.2. SR 4.6.2.1.b.1 requires that each automatic valve in the flow path be verified as actuating to its correct position on a containment spray test signal. The CSS containment isolation valves open on a Safety Features Actuation System (SFAS) Incident Level 2. The containment spray pumps start on an SFAS Incident Level 4. The licensees evaluated the 18-month TS surveillance test data for the CSS automatic valves CS 1530 and CS 1531 and CSS pumps CS 1-1 and CS 1-2 for the period since 1985. This period was selected as most representative of current operating condition since many changes occurred after the loss of feedwater event in 1985. The duration includes five refueling outages and four operating cycles of test results. No test failures for these components occurred over the period reviewed. The licensees reviewed the maintenance history of CS 1530, CS 1531, CS 1-1, and CS 1-2. Although several instances of bearing wear were noted, the bearing wear did not render the pumps inoperable. A modification was made to the coupling hubs for CS 1-1 and CS 1-2 during the last refueling outage to ensure long-term reliability. The licensees concluded that based on the historical good performance of CSS components, the low potential for significant increases in failure rates under a longer test interval, and the introduction of no new failure modes that it was acceptable to increase the surveillance test interval from every 18 months to every REFUELING INTERVAL. The staff has reviewed this information and concludes that the licensee has adequately analyzed the effect of the changes on safety.

TS 4.6.3.1.2 requires that each isolation valve shall be demonstrated OPERABLE during the COLD SHUTDOWN or REFUELING MODE, at least once per 18 months by performing the activities listed in SR 4.6.3.1.2.a and SR 4.6.3.1.2.b. Surveillance Requirement 4.6.3.1.2.a requires verification that on a containment isolation test signal, each automatic isolation valve actuates to its isolation position. Surveillance Requirement 4.6.3.1.2.b requires verification that each purge and exhaust automatic valve actuates to its isolation position on a containment purge and exhaust isolation test signal. The licensees propose to change "during COLD SHUTDOWN or REFUELING MODE at least once per 18 months" with "each REFUELING INTERVAL." Technical Specification 4.0.2 would continue to apply which would allow increasing the new surveillance interval on a non-routine basis from 24 months to 30 months. The licensees provided a list of the specific valves in these two categories. The staff reviewed the list against Updated Safety Analysis Report Table 6.2-23, Containment Vessel Isolation Valve Arrangements, and determined that the scope of valves included in the license amendment application was complete. The licensees' review of surveillance test data and maintenance history discovered four test deficiencies since 1985. None of the deficiencies indicated any programmatic concern with valve maintenance or operation. In general, unless plant conditions or other circumstances prohibit valve stroking at power, containment isolation automatic valves are stroke-tested quarterly in accordance with ASME Section XI Inservice Testing Program. The containment purge and exhaust automatic isolation valves are maintained closed with control power off in Modes 1 through 4. The licensees conclude that the potential impact on safety is small since no additional failure modes are introduced and the potential for significant increases in failure rates of these components under a longer test interval is low. The staff has reviewed this information and concludes that the licensee has adequately analyzed the effect of the changes on safety.

Since the proposed changes are consistent with the guidance in GL 91-04, the staff finds these proposed changes acceptable.

### 3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Ohio State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

### 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment changes a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 or changes a surveillance requirement. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluent that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding (61 FR 52970). Accordingly, the amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to

10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendment.

#### 5.0 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, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) 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 Contributor: L. Gundrum

Date: February 10, 1997