

February 3, 1998

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: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT NO. 219 AND PARTIAL DENIAL OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-3 - DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT 1 (TAC NO. M97391)

Dear Mr. Wood:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 219 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-3 for the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station (DBNPS), Unit 1. The amendment revises the Technical Specifications (TSs) in response to your application dated October 28, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated August 19 and October 16, 1997.

This amendment revises TS Section 3/4.8.1, "A.C. Sources," TS Section 3/4.8.2, "Onsite Power Distribution Systems," TS Table 4.8.1, "Battery Surveillance Requirements," and the associated bases. Surveillance requirements have been modified to account for the increase in the fuel cycle, consistent with Generic Letter 91-04, "Changes in Technical Specification Surveillance Intervals to Accommodate a 24-Month Fuel Cycle," dated April 2, 1991. Administrative changes were also made. As set forth in the enclosed Safety Evaluation, the proposed change to TS 4.8.2.3.2.e has been denied in full, and the proposed changes to TS 4.8.1.1.1.b, TS 4.8.1.1.2.d, TS 4.8.2.3.2.d and TS 4.8.2.3.2.f have been denied in part. Notice of Partial Denial is enclosed.

Notice of Issuance and Notice of Partial Denial 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. 219 to License No. NPF-3  
2. Safety Evaluation  
3. Notice of Partial Denial  
cc w/encls: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

✓ Docket File GHill (2)  
PUBLIC PD3-3 R/F  
OGC WBeckner, TSB  
ACRS EAdensam (EGAl)  
RSavio GGrant, RIII  
SMitra THarris (TLH3, SE only)

1/1  
DF01

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\DAVISBES\DB97391.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-PM	E	PD33-LA	E	EELB-BC		OGC	
NAME	AHansen		EBarnhill		JCalvo *		CBarth *	
DATE	2/2/98		2/3/98		1/13/98		2/2/98	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

9802120285 980203  
PDR ADOCK 05000346  
PDR





UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

February 3, 1998

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: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT NO. 219 AND PARTIAL DENIAL OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-3 - DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT 1 (TAC NO. M97391)

Dear Mr. Wood:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 219 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-3 for the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station (DBNPS), Unit 1. The amendment revises the Technical Specifications (TSs) in response to your application dated October 28, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated August 19 and October 16, 1997.

This amendment revises TS Section 3/4.8.1, "A.C. Sources," TS Section 3/4.8.2, "Onsite Power Distribution Systems," TS Table 4.8.1, "Battery Surveillance Requirements," and the associated bases. Surveillance requirements have been modified to account for the increase in the fuel cycle, consistent with Generic Letter 91-04, "Changes in Technical Specification Surveillance Intervals to Accommodate a 24-Month Fuel Cycle," dated April 2, 1991. Administrative changes were also made. As set forth in the enclosed Safety Evaluation, the proposed change to TS 4.8.2.3.2.e has been denied in full, and the proposed changes to TS 4.8.1.1.1.b, TS 4.8.1.1.2.d, TS 4.8.2.3.2.d and TS 4.8.2.3.2.f have been denied in part. Notice of Partial Denial is enclosed.

Notice of Issuance and Notice of Partial Denial will be included in the Commission's next biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

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. 219 to  
License No. NPF-3  
2. Safety Evaluation  
3. Notice of Partial Denial

cc w/encls: See next page

John K. Wood  
Toledo Edison Company

cc:

Mary E. O'Reilly  
Centerior Energy Corporation  
300 Madison Avenue  
Toledo, OH 43652

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

Gerald Charnoff, Esq.  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts  
and Trowbridge  
2300 N Street, NW.  
Washington, DC 20037

Regional Administrator  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
801 Warrenville Road  
Lisle, IL 60523-4351

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

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

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

Roy P. Lessy, Jr.  
Akin, Gump, Srauss, Hauer & Feld, LLP  
1333 New Hampshire Ave., NW., Ste. 400  
Washington, DC 20036

Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1

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

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

Donna Owens, Director  
Ohio Department of Commerce  
Division of Industrial Compliance  
Bureau of Operations & Maintenance  
6606 Tussing Road  
P.O. Box 4009  
Reynoldsburg, OH 43068-9009

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

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

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

President, Board of County  
Commissioner of Ottawa County  
Port Clinton, OH 43252



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 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 219  
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 October 28, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated August 19 and October 16, 1997, 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:

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 219, 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 3, 1998

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 219

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

TS 3/4 8-2  
TS 3/4 8-4  
TS 3/4 8-9  
TS Bases 3/4 8-1a

Insert

TS 3/4 8-2  
TS 3/4 8-4  
TS 3/4 8-9  
TS Bases 3/4 8-1a

ACTION (Continued)

Requirement 4.8.1.1.2.a.4 within 8 hours. Restore at least one of the inoperable sources to OPERABLE status within 12 hours or be in at least HOT STANDBY within the next 6 hours and in COLD SHUTDOWN within the following 30 hours. With the inoperable offsite source restored, restore two diesel generators to OPERABLE status within 7 days from the time of the initial loss or be in at least HOT STANDBY within the next 6 hours and in COLD SHUTDOWN within the following 30 hours. With the inoperable diesel generator restored, restore two offsite power sources to OPERABLE status within 72 hours from the time of the initial loss or be in at least HOT STANDBY within the next 6 hours and in COLD SHUTDOWN within the following 30 hours.

- d. With two of the above required offsite A.C. circuits inoperable, demonstrate the OPERABILITY of two diesel generators by performing Surveillance Requirement 4.8.1.1.2.a.4 within 8 hours and at least once per 8 hours thereafter, unless the diesel generators are already operating; restore at least one of the inoperable offsite sources to OPERABLE status within 24 hours or be in at least HOT STANDBY within the next 6 hours. With only one offsite source restored, restore at least two offsite circuits to OPERABLE status within 72 hours from time of initial loss or be in at least HOT STANDBY within the next 6 hours and in COLD SHUTDOWN within the following 30 hours.
- e. With two of the above required diesel generators inoperable, demonstrate the OPERABILITY of two offsite A.C. circuits by performing Surveillance Requirement 4.8.1.1.1.a within one hour and at least once per 8 hours thereafter; restore at least one of the inoperable diesel generators to OPERABLE status within 2 hours or be in at least HOT STANDBY within the next 6 hours and in COLD SHUTDOWN within the following 30 hours. Restore at least two diesel generators to OPERABLE status within 7 days from time of initial loss or be in at least HOT STANDBY within the next 6 hours and in COLD SHUTDOWN within the following 30 hours.

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.8.1.1.1 Each of the above required qualified circuits between the offsite transmission network and the onsite Class 1E A.C. electrical power distribution system shall be:

- a. Determined OPERABLE at least once per 7 days by verifying correct breaker alignments and indicated power availability, and
- b. Demonstrated OPERABLE at least once each REFUELING INTERVAL during shutdown by transferring (manually and automatically) unit power supply to each of the offsite circuits.

4.8.1.1.2 Each diesel generator shall be demonstrated OPERABLE:

- a. At least once per 31 days, if Surveillance Requirement 4.8.1.1.2.c has not been performed within the previous 31 days, by:

## ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS

### SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

---

- d. At least once each REFUELING INTERVAL during shutdown by:
1. Verifying the generator capability to reject a load equal to the largest single emergency load supplied by the generator without tripping.
  2. Simulating a loss of offsite power in conjunction with a safety features actuation system (SFAS) test signal, and:
    - (a) Verifying de-energization of the essential busses and load shedding from the essential busses.
    - (b) Verifying the diesel starts from ambient condition on the auto-start signal, energizes the essential busses with permanently connected loads, energizes the auto-connected essential loads through the load sequencer and operates for  $\geq 5$  minutes while its generator is loaded with the essential loads.
    - (c) Verifying that all diesel generator trips, except engine overspeed and generator differential, are automatically bypassed upon loss of voltage on the essential bus and/or an SFAS test signal.
  3. Verifying the diesel generator operates for  $\geq 60$  minutes while loaded to  $\geq 2000$  kw.
  4. Verifying that the auto-connected loads to each diesel generator do not exceed the 2000 hour rating of 2838 kw.
- e. At least once per 30 months by subjecting the diesels to an inspection in accordance with procedures prepared in conjunction with its manufacturer's recommendation for this class of standby service.\*

---

\* The provisions of Specification 4.0.2 are not applicable.

## ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS

### SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

2. Verifying total battery terminal voltage is greater than or equal to 129 volts on float charge.
- b. At least once per 92 days and within 7 days after a battery discharge (battery terminal voltage below 110 volts), or battery overcharge (battery terminal voltage above 150 volts), by:
  1. Verifying that the parameters in Table 4.8-1 meet the Category B limits,
  2. Verifying that there is no visible corrosion at either terminals or connectors, or the connection resistance of these items is less than  $150 \times 10^{-6}$  ohms, and
  3. Verifying that the average electrolyte temperature of every sixth connected cell is above 60 F.
- c. At least once per 18 months by verifying that the battery charger will supply at least 475 amperes at a minimum of 130 volts for at least 8 hours; and at least once each REFUELING INTERVAL by verifying that:
  1. The cells, cell plates and battery racks show no visual indication of physical damage or abnormal deterioration,
  2. The cell-to-cell and terminal connections are clean, tight and coated with anti-corrosion material, and
  3. The resistance of each cell-to-cell and terminal connection is less than or equal to  $150 \times 10^{-6}$  Ohms.
- d. At least once each REFUELING INTERVAL, during shutdown, by verifying that the battery capacity is adequate to supply and maintain in OPERABLE status all of the actual or simulated emergency loads for the design duty cycle when the battery is subjected to a battery service test.
- e. At least once per 60 months, during shutdown, by verifying that the battery capacity is at least 80% of the manufacturer's rating when subjected to a performance discharge test. Once per 60 month interval this performance discharge test may be performed in lieu of the battery service test.
- f. Every REFUELING INTERVAL, during shutdown, performance discharge tests of battery capacity shall be given to any battery that shows signs of degradation or has reached 85% of the service life expected for the application. Degradation is indicated when the battery capacity drops more than 10% of rated capacity from its average on previous performance tests, or is below 90% of the manufacturer's rating.

### 3/4.8 ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS

#### BASES

---

Surveillance Requirements 4.8.1.1.2.a.4 and 4.8.1.1.2.c.4 verify proper starting of the Emergency Diesel Generators from standby conditions. Verification that an Emergency Diesel Generator has achieved a frequency of 60 Hz within the required time constraints meets the requirement for verifying the Emergency Diesel Generator has accelerated to 900 RPM.

The OPERABILITY of the minimum specified A.C. and D.C. power sources and associated distribution systems during shutdown and refueling ensures that 1) the facility can be maintained in the shutdown or refueling condition for extended time periods and 2) sufficient instrumentation and control capability is available for monitoring and maintaining the facility status.

The Surveillance Requirements for demonstrating the OPERABILITY of the station batteries are based on the recommendations of Regulatory Guide 1.129, "Maintenance Testing and Replacement of Large Lead Storage Batteries for Nuclear Power Plants", February 1978, and IEEE Std. 450-1980, "IEEE Recommended Practice for Maintenance, Testing, and Replacement of Large Lead Storage Batteries for Generating Stations and Substations," except that certain tests will be performed at least once each REFUELING INTERVAL.

Verifying average electrolyte temperature above the minimum for which the battery was sized, total battery terminal voltage on float charge, connection resistance values and the performance of battery service and discharge tests ensures the effectiveness of the charging system, the ability to handle high discharge rates and compares the battery capacity at that time with the rated capacity.

Table 4.8-1 specifies the normal limits for each designated pilot cell and each connected cell for electrolyte level, float voltage and specific gravity. The limits for the designated pilot cells float voltage and specific gravity, greater than 2.13 volts and .015 below the manufacturer's full charge specific gravity or a battery charger current of less than two amps is characteristic of a charged cell with adequate capacity. The normal limits for each connected cell for float voltage and specific gravity, greater than 2.13 volts and not more than .020 below the manufacturer's full charge specific gravity with an average specific gravity of all the connected cells not more than .010 below the manufacturer's full charge specific gravity, ensures the OPERABILITY and capability of the battery. Exceptions to the specific gravity requirements are taken to allow for the normal deviations experienced after a battery discharge and subsequent recharge associated with a service or performance discharge test. The specific gravity deviations are recognized and discussed in IEEE 450-1980.



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 219 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 1  
DOCKET NO. 50-346

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated October 28, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated August 19 and October 16, 1997, Toledo Edison Company (TE), 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 1, Technical Specifications (TSs). The supplemental information did not impact the proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The requested amendment would revise TS Section 3/4.8.1, "A.C. Sources," TS Section 3/4.8.2, "Onsite Power Distribution Systems," TS Table 4.8.1, "Battery Surveillance Requirements," and the associated bases. Surveillance requirements would be modified to account for the increase in the fuel cycle from 18 to 24 months. Administrative changes would also be made.

On August 19, 1997, TE responded to a request for additional information (RAI) dated June 25, 1997. During subsequent telephone conversations with TE on September 29, October 1, October 8, October 15, and December 29, 1997, the issues identified in the RAI were further explained, new issues were identified and additional information regarding DBNPS surveillance test programs was obtained. As mentioned in the first four discussions and summarized in a TE letter dated October 16, 1997, TE will submit a license amendment application by the end of 1998 to propose additional TS changes to address the issues identified by the staff. This should allow ample time for the staff to review and approve the request prior to the next scheduled battery performance testing in the spring of 2000.

## 2.0 BACKGROUND

Improved reactor fuels allow licensees to consider an increase in the duration of the fuel cycle for their facilities. The staff has reviewed requests for individual plants to modify surveillance intervals to be compatible with a 24-month fuel cycle. The NRC issued Generic Letter (GL) 91-04, "Changes in Technical Specification Surveillance Intervals to Accommodate a 24-Month Fuel Cycle," on April 2, 1991, to provide generic guidance to licensees for preparing such license amendment requests.

TSs that specify an 18-month surveillance interval could be changed to state that these surveillances are to be performed once per refueling interval. The notation for surveillance intervals would then be changed to include the definition of a "Refueling Interval" with the existing "R" notation for surveillances that are generally performed during a refueling outage. The frequency for the interval indicated by this notation would also be changed from 18 months to "at least once every 24 months." The provision to extend surveillances by 25 percent of the specified interval would extend the time limit for completing these surveillances from the existing limit of 22.5 months to a maximum of 30 months.

Licensees must address instrument drift when proposing an increase in the surveillance interval for calibrating instruments that perform safety functions to include providing the capability for safe shutdown. The effect of the increased calibration interval on instrument errors must be addressed because instrument errors caused by drift were considered when determining safety system setpoints and when performing safety analyses.

For other 18-month surveillances, licensees should evaluate the effect on safety of the change in surveillance intervals to accommodate a 24-month fuel cycle. This evaluation should support a conclusion that the effect on safety is small. In addition, licensees should confirm that historical maintenance and surveillance data do not invalidate this conclusion. Licensees should confirm that the performance of surveillances at the bounding surveillance interval limit provided to accommodate a 24-month fuel cycle would not invalidate any assumption in the plant licensing basis. In consideration of these confirmations, the licensees need not quantify the effect of the change in surveillance intervals on the availability of individual systems or components.

## 3.0 EVALUATION

This license amendment request will extend several surveillance testing intervals from every 18 months to each refueling interval. The licensees proposed replacing "at least once per 18 months" with "at least once each REFUELING INTERVAL," for the TSs described below. "Refueling Interval" is currently defined in the DBNPS TSs as "a period of time  $\leq$  730 days" for a 24-month fuel cycle.

Consistent with the guidance in GL 91-04, the licensees also proposed to remove the restriction "during shutdown" from several of the TSs. This GL guidance is not consistent with the current NRC Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR), Electrical Engineering Branch, technical position for several electrical power system TSs. This technical position is reflected in NUREG-1430, "Standard Technical Specifications - Babcock and Wilcox Plants," dated April 1995. Therefore, where noted below, the licensees' requests to remove the restriction "during shutdown" have been denied. As noted in the TE supplemental submittals, and by telephone conversation between TE and NRR staff on December 29, 1997, the licensees confirmed that these denials would have no safety impact on plant operations.

The proposed changes allow the continued application of TS 4.0.2. This TS allows surveillance intervals to be increased up to 25 percent on a nonroutine basis (30 months) in accordance with the GL. A paragraph was added (Amendment 213, dated February 10, 1997) to TS Bases 4.0.2, consistent with GL 91-04, which ensures that surveillances are performed in an operational mode consistent with safe plant operation. This TS bases section already included 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 performed the safety assessment for the proposed changes to the surveillance test intervals in accordance with the GL 91-04 requirements stated above. This assessment entailed reviewing the historical maintenance and surveillance test data at the bounding surveillance interval limit, performing an evaluation to ensure that a 24-month surveillance test interval would not invalidate any assumption in the plant licensing bases, and the determination that the effect on safety is small. Only the period since 1985 was reviewed. This is most representative of current operating conditions since many changes occurred after the loss of feedwater event in 1985. This period includes five refueling outages and four operating cycles of test results.

### 3.1 Surveillance Requirement 4.8.1.1.1.b (partial denial)

The existing TS surveillance requirement (SR) 4.8.1.1.1.b requires that at least once per 18 months, during shutdown, each qualified circuit between the offsite transmission network and the onsite Class 1E A.C. electrical power distribution system be demonstrated operable by transferring (manually and automatically) the unit power supply to each of the offsite circuits.

The proposed change in SR 4.8.1.1.1.b replaces the words "at least once per 18 months, during shutdown" with "at least once each REFUELING INTERVAL." As discussed in Section 3.0, the removal of the restriction "during shutdown" is denied.

TE reviewed the licensing basis, applicable surveillance data and maintenance records. The licensees determined that during the period since 1985, which includes five refueling outages and four operating cycles, no failures

occurred during surveillance testing. The licensees also reviewed maintenance records related to this SR. No problems were identified that resulted in equipment being inoperable.

The licensees concluded that, based on the results of the maintenance and surveillance review, the change to a 24-month fuel cycle was acceptable. In addition, the licensees concluded that the licensing basis would not be invalidated by increasing the surveillance interval, and that the impact on safety would be small. Further, the licensees determined that it would be acceptable to continue with the application of TS 4.0.2 on a nonroutine basis.

The staff reviewed the proposed changes and the licensing basis and determined that all actions specified in the GL were completed. The effect on safety would be small, historical data do not contradict this conclusion, and no assumptions in the plant licensing basis would be invalidated. Therefore, this change (except the partial denial as described above) is acceptable.

### 3.2 SR 4.8.1.1.2.d (partial denial)

SR 4.8.1.1.2.d requires that each emergency diesel generator (EDG) be demonstrated operable at least once per 18 months during shutdown by:

- (1) Verifying the EDG capability to reject a load equal to the largest single emergency load without tripping;
- (2) Simulating a loss of offsite power in conjunction with a safety features actuation system (SFAS) test signal:
  - (a) Verifying de-energization of the essential busses and load shedding from the essential busses;
  - (b) Verifying the EDG starts from ambient condition on the auto-start signal, energizes the essential busses with permanently connected loads, energizes the auto-connected essential loads through the load sequencer and operates for  $\geq 5$  minutes while the generator is loaded with essential loads; and
  - (c) Verifying that all EDG trips, except engine overspeed and generator differential, are automatically bypassed upon loss of voltage on the essential bus and/or an SFAS test signal;
- (3) Verifying that the EDG operates for  $\geq 60$  minutes while loaded to  $\geq 2,000$  kw; and
- (4) Verifying that the auto-connected loads to each EDG do not exceed the 2,000 hour rating of 2,838 kw.

It is proposed that in SR 4.8.1.1.2.d, the words "at least once per 18 months, during shutdown" be replaced with "at least once each REFUELING INTERVAL." As discussed in Section 3.0, the removal of the restriction "during shutdown" is denied.

TE reviewed the licensing basis, applicable surveillance data, and maintenance records. The licensees determined that during the period since 1985, which includes five refueling outages and four operating cycles, three failures occurred during surveillance testing. Two sequencer relays failed and one EDG failed to reach rated voltage during a monthly test due to a degraded field flash contactor. Preventive maintenance and regular replacement activity was initiated to minimize further failures of the relays. The contactor was replaced and a timing program was initiated to ensure proper function, though an extended fuel cycle would not impact failure identification, as this is subject to monthly testing.

The licensees reviewed maintenance records related to this SR. No abnormal component degradations or other anomalies were identified that would impact a change to a 24-month fuel cycle.

The licensees concluded that, based on the results of the maintenance and surveillance review, the change to a 24-month fuel cycle was acceptable. In addition, the licensees concluded that the licensing basis would not be invalidated by increasing the surveillance interval, and that the impact on safety would be small. Further, the licensees determined that it would be acceptable to continue with the application of TS 4.0.2 on a nonroutine basis.

The staff reviewed the proposed changes and the licensing basis and determined that all actions specified in the GL were completed. The effect on safety would be small, historical data (with the corrective actions factored in) do not contradict this conclusion, and no assumptions in the plant licensing basis would be invalidated. Therefore, this change (except the partial denial as described above) is acceptable.

### 3.3 SR 4.8.2.3.2.c (accepted) and SR 4.8.2.3.2.d (partial denial)

SR 4.8.2.3.2.c requires that at least once per 18 months each 125-volt battery and charger shall be demonstrated operable by verifying:

- (1) The cells, cell plates, and battery racks show no visual indication of physical damage or abnormal deterioration;
- (2) The cell-to-cell and terminal connections are clean, tight, and coated with anti-corrosion material;
- (3) The resistance of each cell-to-cell and terminal connection is less than or equal to  $150 \times 10^{-6}$  ohms; and
- (4) The battery charger will supply at least 475 amperes at a minimum of 130 volts for at least 8 hours.

The battery charger testing required in the current SR 4.8.2.3.2.c.4 is normally performed with the plant online (each train has a standby battery charger which is used during the online testing) and will continue to be performed on an 18-month frequency. To reflect the intent to continue to perform current SR 4.8.2.3.2.c.4 on an 18-month interval, but to perform current SRs 4.8.2.3.2.c.1, 2, and 3 each refueling interval, TE proposes to relocate SR 4.8.2.3.2.c.4 into SR 4.8.2.3.2.c, rewording SR 4.8.2.3.3.c as follows:

- "c. At least once per 18 months by verifying that the battery chargers will supply at least 475 amperes at a minimum of 130 volts for at least 8 hours; and at least once each REFUELING INTERVAL by verifying that:"

SR 4.8.2.3.2.d requires that at least once per 18 months, during shutdown, each 125-volt battery and charger be verified operable by verifying that the battery capacity is adequate to supply and maintain in operable status all of the actual or simulated emergency loads for the design duty cycle when the battery is subjected to a battery service test.

TE proposes that in SR 4.8.2.3.2.d, the words "At least once per 18 months, during shutdown" be replaced with "At least once each REFUELING INTERVAL." As discussed in Section 3.0, the removal of the restriction "during shutdown" is denied.

TE reviewed the licensing basis, applicable surveillance data, and maintenance records. The licensees determined that during the period from January 1990 (after battery replacement was completed) through October 1994, no failures occurred during surveillance testing. The licensees reviewed maintenance records related to these SRs over the same time period. No problems were identified that resulted in equipment being inoperable.

The licensees concluded that, based on the results of the maintenance and surveillance review, the change to a 24-month fuel cycle was acceptable. In addition, the licensees concluded that the licensing basis would not be invalidated by increasing the surveillance interval, and that the impact on safety would be small. Further, the licensees determined that it would be acceptable to continue with the application of TS 4.0.2 on a nonroutine basis.

The staff reviewed the proposed changes and the licensing basis and determined that all actions specified in the GL were completed. The effect on safety would be small, historical data do not contradict this conclusion, and no assumptions in the plant licensing basis would be invalidated. Therefore, this change (except the partial denial as described above) is acceptable.

#### 3.4 SR 4.8.2.3.2.e (denial)

SR 4.8.2.3.2.e requires that at least once per 60 months, during shutdown, each 125-volt battery and charger be verified operable by verifying that the battery capacity is at least 80 percent of the manufacturer's rating when

subjected to a performance discharge test. Once per 60-month interval, this performance discharge test may be performed in lieu of the battery service test.

TE proposes that in SR 4.8.2.3.2.e, the words "during shutdown" be deleted.

As stated in Section 3.0 above, the removal of the words "during shutdown" is not acceptable. Therefore, this proposed change is denied.

During the review of this proposed change, the staff identified an issue outside the scope of the current license amendment request. In an RAI dated June 25, 1997, the staff requested the following information regarding SR 4.8.2.3.2.e:

- (a) Please explain how the battery discharge test will be performed once per 60 months while the unit is operating without going beyond the limits of the LCO (which requires restoration of the battery to operable status within 2 hours); and
- (b) This SR states:

Once per 60-month interval, this performance discharge test may be performed in lieu of the battery service test.

Does the performance discharge test envelop the battery service test?

In their response of August 19, 1997, TE stated:

Although the proposed revision to SR 4.8.2.3.2.e removes the restriction to conduct performance discharge testing "during shutdown," the DBNPS does not plan to perform battery discharge testing while the plant is operating. Under a 24-month fuel cycle, performance discharge testing is planned to be performed during every other refueling outage, or approximately every 4 years. The purpose of the proposed revision is to bring the SR into conformance with NRC Generic Letter (GL) 91-04, "Changes in Technical Specification Surveillance Intervals to Accommodate a 24-Month Fuel Cycle," dated April 2, 1991, wherein the NRC staff concluded that the TS need not restrict surveillances as only being performed during shutdown, and that licensees are to give proper regard for performing refueling interval surveillances during power operation or during another mode that is consistent with the safe conduct of the surveillance.

With the second part of the question, the performance test load profile does not completely envelop the service test load profile, in particular during the first minute of the service test load profile. However, the total ampere-hours discharged during the performance test exceeds the total ampere-hours discharged during the service test. In other words, the performance test is more challenging in terms of battery capacity, but the service test is more challenging in terms of voltage drop during the first minute high current demand.

As stated in TS Bases 3/4.8, the Surveillance Requirements for demonstrating OPERABILITY of the station batteries are based on the recommendation of Regulatory Guide 1.129, "Maintenance Testing and Replacement of Large Lead Storage Batteries for Nuclear Power Plants," February 1978, and IEEE Std. 450-1980, "IEEE Recommended Practice for Maintenance, Testing, and Replacement of Large Lead Storage Batteries for Generating Stations and Substations." The DBNPS is aware that the more recent IEEE Std. 450-1995 discusses a "modified" performance test that would envelop the load profile of the service test. This "modified" performance test is a worst case load profile of the traditional service test and performance test combined.

However, the purpose of LAR 95-0021 [this amendment request] is to propose changes pertinent to the increased operating cycle duration, consistent with the NRC's guidance in GL 91-04. Adoption of more current testing techniques is outside the scope of the proposed License Amendment Request and beyond the current Licensing Basis. However, the DBNPS may consider the adoption of a later version of IEEE Std. 450 during the course of the conversion of the current DBNPS Technical Specification to the improved "Standard Technical Specification for Babcock and Wilcox Plants," as contained within NUREG-1430 (ISTS). As stated in its [sic] November 26, 1996, letter to NRC (TE Serial Number 2418), the DBNPS presently plans to submit a License Amendment Request relative to conversion to the ISTS in 1999.

During subsequent telephone conversations regarding the first issue, the staff enquired why DBNPS is proposing to remove the restriction to conduct performance discharge testing "during shutdown," when DBNPS does not plan to perform the battery discharge test while the plant is operating with a 24-month fuel cycle. Battery discharge testing is planned to be performed during every other refueling outage, or approximately every 4 years.

Regarding the second part of the question, the staff indicated that not performing the modified performance discharge test described IEEE Std. 450-1995 and NUREG-1430 may create a safety problem. TE responded in the October 16, 1997, letter:

Regarding the first part of the question, TE believes that the proposed change, removing the phrase "during shutdown" from the SR, is consistent with the NRC's recommendation in GL 91-04. However, should the NRC staff choose to not approve this portion of the License Amendment application, it would not impact the conversion of the DBNPS TS to a 24-month fuel cycle.

Regarding the second part of the question, TE notes that the last battery performance discharge tests were performed in the fall of 1994 during the Ninth Refueling Outage (9RFO) for station batteries "2P" and "2N," and in the spring of 1996 during 10RFO for station batteries "1P" and "1N." Hence, given the 60-month surveillance interval of SR 4.8.2.3.2.e, battery performance discharge testing is not due during the upcoming 11RFO, which is scheduled to commence in April 1998. The results of the last

performance discharge tests for these batteries were as follows: 124.5% capacity for station battery "1P," 121.1% capacity for station battery "1N," 118.9% capacity for station battery "2P," and 123.3% capacity for station battery "2N." The oldest of these batteries was installed in September 1986.

Considering the above, TE proposes to submit a separate License Amendment application for a change to SR 4.8.2.3.2.e to reflect the modified performance discharge test described in IEEE Std. 450-1995 and NUREG-1430. This License Amendment application will be submitted by the end of 1998, which should allow ample time for NRC review and approval prior to the next scheduled performance of SR 4.8.2.3.2.e in the spring of 2000 (12RF0), for station batteries "2P" and "2N"....

The staff acknowledges that the licensees have committed to submit a separate license amendment application.

### 3.5 SR 4.8.2.3.2.f (partial denial)

SR 4.8.2.3.2.f requires that each 125-volt battery and charger be verified operable every 18 months, during shutdown, through performance discharge tests of battery capacity given to any battery that shows signs of degradation or has reached 85 percent of the service life expected for the application. Degradation is indicated when the battery capacity drops more than 10 percent of rated capacity from its average on previous performance tests, or is below 90 percent of the manufacturer's rating.

TE proposes that in SR 4.8.2.3.2.f, the words "Every 18 months, during shutdown" be replaced with "Every REFUELING INTERVAL."

TE reviewed the licensing basis, applicable surveillance data, and maintenance records. The licensees determined that during the period from January 1990 (after battery replacement was completed) through October 1994, no failures occurred during surveillance testing. The licensees reviewed maintenance records related to these SRs over the same time period. No problems were identified that resulted in equipment being inoperable.

The licensees concluded that, based on the results of the maintenance and surveillance review, the change to a 24-month fuel cycle was acceptable. In addition, the licensees concluded that the licensing basis would not be invalidated by increasing the surveillance interval, and that the impact on safety would be small. Further, the licensees determined that it would be acceptable to continue with the application of TS 4.0.2 on a nonroutine basis.

The staff reviewed the proposed changes and the licensing basis and determined that all actions specified in the GL were completed. The effect on safety would be small, historical data do not contradict this conclusion, and no assumptions in the plant licensing basis would be invalidated. Therefore, this change (except the partial denial as described above) is acceptable.

During the review of this proposed change, the staff identified an issue outside the scope of the current license amendment request. In an RAI dated June 25, 1997, the staff posed the following question regarding SR 4.8.2.3.2.f:

This SR states:

Degradation is indicated when the battery capacity drops more than 10% of rated capacity from its average on previous performance tests, or is below 90% of the manufacturer's rating.

Should this read "...previous performance test..." as per IEEE Std. 450, instead of "...average on previous performance tests..." as noted in your application?

Toledo Edison's August 19, 1997, Response:

The existing SR was added to the DBNPS TS via License Amendment No. 100, dated March 12, 1987, based on by [sic] model Technical Specifications for station batteries guidance provided by the NRC to Toledo Edison (TE Log Number 756, dated July 16, 1981), and is consistent with IEEE Std. 450-1980. However, the more recent IEEE Std. 450-1995 bases the degradation determination only on the most recent test, rather than the average of previous tests. As noted above, the purpose of LAR 95-0021 is to propose changes pertinent to the increased operating cycle duration, consistent with the NRC's guidance in Generic Letter 91-04. Adoption of more current testing requirements is outside the scope of the proposed License Amendment Request and beyond the current Licensing Basis. However, the DBNPS may consider the adoption of a later version of IEEE Std. 450 during the course of the conversion of the current DBNPS Technical Specifications to the ISTS.

During subsequent telephone conferences, the staff questioned whether the average of previous tests, which is consistent with IEEE Std. 450-1980, provides the true capacity of the batteries because it fails to account for sudden degradation of the battery capacity. On the other hand, IEEE Std. 450-1995 bases degradation determination only on the most recent test, thereby accounting for a sudden degradation.

Toledo Edison's October 16, 1997, Response:

As previously noted, given the 60-month required surveillance interval for SR 4.8.2.3.2.e, only service testing and no battery performance discharge testing is scheduled during the upcoming 11RFO, which is scheduled to commence in April 1998. The oldest station batteries, "1P" and "1N," which were installed in September 1986, will not reach 85% of their service life until 12RFO. They will then need to be performance tested under the current SR 4.8.2.3.2.f, if they are not replaced.

Toledo Edison proposes to include in the above-mentioned separate License Amendment application a proposed change to SR 4.8.2.3.2.f to reflect that the test criteria should be based on the most recent test rather than based on the average of previous testing. This is consistent with IEEE Std. 450-1995 and NUREG-1430. As noted above, this License Amendment application will be submitted by the end of 1998. This should allow ample time for NRC review and approval prior to the next scheduled battery performance testing in the spring of 2000 (12RFO).

In response to the staff telephone inquiry of October 1, 1997, TE stated in the October 16, 1997, response:

Regarding SR 4.8.2.3.2.f:

This SR presently states:

Every 18 months, during shutdown, performance discharge tests of battery capacity shall be given to any battery that shows signs of degradation or has reached 85% of the service life expected for the application. Degradation is indicated when the battery capacity drops more than 10% of rated capacity from its average on previous performance tests, or is below 90% of the manufacturer's rating.

The October 28, 1996 License Amendment application proposes to change the surveillance interval from "Every 18 months" to "Every REFUELING INTERVAL." However, the underlying purpose of this surveillance requirement is to increase the frequency of conducting performance discharge tests when the battery has reached 85% of its service life or when degradation is indicated. The proposed License Amendment would not increase this test frequency.

Toledo Edison has reviewed this issue and concurs with the NRC staff's conclusion. In light of the underlying purpose of this surveillance requirement, should the NRC not approve this portion of the License Amendment, it would not impact the conversion of the DBNPS TS to a 24-month fuel cycle. This is because the surveillance requirement for an increased test frequency is only applicable after the battery performance has degraded (as defined in SR 4.8.2.3.2.f), or reached 85% of its service life. The oldest station batteries, "1P" and "1N," which were installed in September, 1986, will not reach 85% of their service life until 12RFO. They will then need to be performance tested under the current SR 4.8.2.3.2.f, if they are not replaced.

Toledo Edison will include proposed changes that would make the present SR 4.8.2.3.2.f consistent with the increased test frequency as specified in IEEE Std. 450-1995 and NUREG-1430, in the scope of the above-mentioned separate License Amendment application. The proposed SR 4.8.2.3.2.f would read:

Except as noted below, an annual performance discharge or modified performance discharge test of battery capacity shall be given to any battery that shows signs of degradation or has reached 85% of the service life expected for the application. Degradation is indicated when the battery capacity drops more than 10% from its capacity on the previous performance discharge or modified performance discharge test, or is below 90% of the manufacturer's rating. If the battery has reached 85% of service life, delivers a capacity of 100% or greater of the manufacturer's rated capacity, and has shown no signs of degradation, performance testing at 2-year intervals is acceptable until the battery shows signs of degradation.

The staff acknowledges that the licensees have committed to submit a separate license amendment application.

### 3.6 TS Table 4.8-1

The staff posed the following questions in its RAI of June 25, 1997:

Regarding Table 4.8-1, "Battery Surveillance Requirements":

- (a) Is the restriction on "level" in Footnote (a) necessary?; and
- (b) Is the restriction "...following a service or performance discharge test..." in Footnote (c) necessary?

### Toledo Edison's August 19, 1997, Response:

Technical Specification Table 4.8-1, including current Footnote (a), was added to the DBNPS TS via License Amendment No. 100, dated March 12, 1987, based on the model Technical Specifications for station batteries guidance provided by the NRC to Toledo Edison (TE Log Number 756, dated July 16, 1981). Although the Footnote (a) correction of the specific gravity parameter for electrolyte level is not required in the more recent IEEE Std. 450-1995, the purpose of LAR 95-0021 is to propose changes pertinent to the increased operating cycle duration, consistent with the NRC's guidance in Generic Letter 91-04. As indicated above, adoption of more current testing requirements is outside the scope of the proposed License Amendment Request and beyond the current Licensing Basis. However, the DBNPS may consider the adoption of a later version of IEEE Std. 450 during the course of the conversion of the current DBNPS Technical Specifications to the ISTS.

Footnote (c) to TS Table 4.8-1, "Battery Surveillance Requirements," was added via License Amendment No. 158, dated July 16, 1991, in response to the Toledo Edison license amendment application dated March 1, 1991 (TE Serial Number 1898). This footnote adds exceptions to the specific gravity requirements. As stated in the portion of TS Bases 3/4.8, also added via License Amendment 158, the exceptions to the specific gravity requirements are taken to allow for the normal deviations experienced

after a battery discharge and subsequent recharge associated with a service or performance discharge test, and the specific gravity deviations are recognized and discussed in IEEE Std. 450-1980.

As further described in the March 1, 1991, license amendment application and in the NRC Safety Evaluation accompanying License Amendment No. 158, a float charging current of less than 2 amperes is an acceptable method to declare the battery operable after a discharge test; other battery parameters, i.e., specific gravity, take longer to stabilize and cannot provide an immediate and an accurate determination of state-of-charge. In addition, data has shown that battery charging current responds more quickly than specific gravity readings to changes in the state-of-charge. Therefore, using charging current to determine the state-of-charge of the battery following a discharge test reduces the amount of time required to declare a battery operable. The March 1, 1991, license amendment application was requested to allow for a potential reduction of critical path duration during a refueling outage.

The words "...following a service or performance discharge test..." are necessary since they preclude use of the float charging current measurement in lieu of specific gravity measurement for the 7-day (SR 4.8.2.3.2.a.1) and 92-day (SR 4.8.2.3.2.b.1) surveillance tests, when the specific gravity would reasonably be expected to be stable and capable of providing an immediate and accurate determination of state-of-charge.

Toledo Edison October 16, 1997, Response:

Based on discussions with the NRC staff, although the NRC does not believe that the noted restrictions in footnotes (a) and (c) of TS Table 4.8-1 are necessary, the NRC does not require that TE revise these footnotes.

Toledo Edison plans to reevaluate this issue during preparation of the above-mentioned separate License Amendment application, and may include additional proposed changes in the scope of that application, if warranted.

Based on above, the staff finds the TE response acceptable.

3.7 Additional NRC RAI Request

The RAI stated:

Regarding LAR 95-0021, Enclosure 3, Page 3:

The second paragraph indicates that the sizing of the batteries includes approximately 20% overcapacity to compensate for loss due to aging of batteries over a 20-year period. Please provide details on how this conclusion was reached.

Toledo Edison August 19, 1997, Response:

Section 8.3.2.1.2 of the DBNPS Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR) describes the station batteries and cites the referenced statement regarding sizing of the batteries. USAR Section 8.3.2.1.2 also includes a detailed load list for each battery, taken from DBNPS Calculation C-EE-002.01-010. The calculation shows that the battery is adequately sized to accommodate anticipated aging degradation to 80% of rated capacity, while still being capable of performing its safety function. The calculation utilizes an aging factor of 1.32 for cell sizing, which includes the 1.25 aging factor recommended in IEEE Std. 485-1983, "Recommended Practice for Sizing Large Lead Storage Batteries for Generating Stations and Substations," plus additional conservatism to compensate for a battery charged to only 95% of capacity ( $1.25 \times 100\%/95\% = 1.32$ ).

The "20-year period" refers to the design life of the current station batteries. However, the manufacturer-provided qualified service life of the current station batteries is actually a more conservative 16 years. Since a capacity test result of less than 80% (reference TS SR 4.8.2.3.2.e) is actually what indicates end of battery life, the reference to "20-year" life for aging consideration does not have any correlation to a Technical Specification requirement. Technical Specification SR 4.8.2.3.2.f requires that performance discharge tests of battery capacity be given to any battery that shows signs of degradation or has reached 85% of the service life expected for the application. Since 16 years is the service life expected, this SR is required to be performed at 85% of 16 years, or 13.6 years from installation.

Toledo Edison October 16, 1997, Response:

The station batteries were initially sized to meet the original plant loads. Although "design margin" is not explicitly included in the current battery sizing calculation, the plant modification process, which is conducted in accordance with DBNPS procedure NG-EN-00301, "Plant Modifications," ensures that any plant modification affecting battery capacity is evaluated to ensure that all DC design parameters are properly addressed. Further, a battery aging correction factor of 1.32 is used to accommodate a battery aged to 80% capacity and charged to 95% capacity. This value corresponds to the operability criterion defined in the TS, which establishes that the battery is declared inoperable once it falls below 80% of rated capacity.

The staff finds the TE response acceptable.

3.8 TS Bases 3/4.8, "ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS"

These bases have been modified to account for the performance of certain tests at least once each refueling interval. Since the modification is consistent with the TS changes evaluated above, the staff finds it acceptable.

#### 4.0 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.

#### 5.0 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 (62 FR 132). 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.

#### 6.0 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: S.K. Mitra

Date: February 3, 1998

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

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has partially denied a request by Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company, and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (the licensees) to amend Facility Operating License NPF-3 issued to the licensees for operation of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, located in Ottawa County, Ohio. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of the amendment was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on January 2, 1997 (62 FR 132).

The purpose of the licensees' amendment request was to revise Technical Specification (TS) Section 3/4.8.1, "A.C. Sources," TS Section 3/4.8.2, "Onsite Power Distribution Systems," TS Table 4.8.1, "Battery Surveillance Requirements," and the associated bases. Surveillance requirements were modified to account for an increase in the fuel cycle. Administrative changes were also made.

The proposed changes to TS 4.8.1.1.1.b, TS 4.8.1.1.2.d, TS 4.8.2.3.2.d and TS 4.8.2.3.2.f were denied in part. The proposed change to TS 4.8.2.3.2.e was denied. The licensees requested to remove the restriction "during

9802120296 980203  
PDR ADOCK 05000346  
P PDR

shutdown" from these TSs. These removals were denied because these removals would be inconsistent with current staff positions.

The NRC staff has concluded that part of the licensees' request cannot be granted. The licensees were notified of the Commission's partial denial of the proposed change by letter dated February 3, 1998.

By March 11, 1998, the licensees may demand a hearing with respect to the partial denial described above. 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, DC 20555, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date.

A copy of any petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to Jay E. Silberg, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037, attorney for the licensees.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment dated October 28, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated August 19 and October 16, 1997, and (2) the Commission's letter to the licensees dated February 3, 1998.

These documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room and at the local public document room located at the University of Toledo, William Carlson Library, Government Documents Collection, 2801 West Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, OH 43606.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this third day of February 1998.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. G. Hansen", written in a cursive style.

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

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: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT NO. AND PARTIAL DENIAL OF AMENDMENT TO  
 FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-3 - DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER  
 STATION, UNIT 1 (TAC NO. M97391)

Dear Mr. Wood:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. to Facility Operating License No. NPF-3 for the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station (DBNPS), Unit 1. The amendment revises the Technical Specifications (TSs) in response to your application dated October 28, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated August 19 and October 16, 1997.

This amendment revises TS Section 3/4.8.1, "A.C. Sources," TS Section 3/4.8.2, "Onsite Power Distribution Systems," TS Table 4.8.1, "Battery Surveillance Requirements," and the associated bases. Surveillance requirements have been modified to account for the increase in the fuel cycle, consistent with Generic Letter 91-04, "Changes in Technical Specification Surveillance Intervals to Accommodate a 24-Month Fuel Cycle," dated April 2, 1991. Administrative changes were also made. As set forth in the enclosed Safety Evaluation, the proposed changes to TS 4.8.2.3.2.e and TS 4.8.2.3.2.f have been denied in full, and the proposed changes to TS 4.8.1.1.1.b, TS 4.8.1.1.2.d and TS 4.8.2.3.2.d have been denied in part. Notice of Partial Denial is enclosed.

Notice of Issuance and Notice of Partial Denial will be included in the Commission's next biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

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. to License No. NPF-3  
 2. Safety Evaluation  
 3. Notice of Partial Denial  
 cc w/encls: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:  
 Docket File GHill (2)  
 PUBLIC PD3-3 R/F  
 OGC WBeckner, TSB  
 ACRS EAdensam (EGA1)  
 RSavio GGrant, RIII  
 SMitra THarris (TLH3, SE only)

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\DAVISBES\DB97391.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-PM	E	PD33-LA	E	EELB-BC	E	OGC
NAME	AHansen		EBarnhill		JCalvo		
DATE	1/15/98		1/14/98		1/13/98		2/12/98

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

480220285 2pp

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this third day of February 1998.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Original signed by:

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

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File  
PD3-3 R/F  
RSavio  
OGC

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\DAVISBES\DB97391.BWI

\* See previous concurrence

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

OFFICE	LA:PDIII-3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PM:PDIII-3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	OGC
NAME	EBarnhill <i>EB</i>		AHansen <i>AH</i>		CBarth * <i>CB</i>
DATE	1/29/98		1/29/98		1/22/98

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY