AVERAGE DAILY UNIT POWER LEVEL

DOCKET NO. 50-346

UNIT Davis-Besse

DATE August 7, 1979

COMPLETED BY Erdal Caba

TELEPHONE 259-5000 Ext. 236

AVERAGE DAILY POWER LEVEL (MWe-Net)	DAY	AVERAGE DAILY POWER LEV (MWe-Net) 882
0	17	
0	18	878
0	19	881
0	20	879
0	21	887
0	22	869
0	- 23	873
0	24	871
0	25	872
0	26	866
0	27	874
259	28	873
440	29	877
739	30	876
798	31	872
847		

INSTRUCTIONS

On this format, list the average daily unit power level in MWe-Net for each day in the reporting month. Compute to the nearest whole megawatt.

(9/77)

OPERATING DATA REPORT

DATE | 50-346 | August 7, 1979 | E. Caba | 239-5000 | Ext. 236

David	-Besse Unit 1	Commence of	Notes	
1. Utur Politic.	1979			W =
at arehatting	2772			*
3. Licensed Thermal Power (MWt)				
4. Nameplate Rating (Gross MWe)	006			
5. Design Electrical Rating (Net M	(Canan Mwa): To	be det.		
6. Maximum Dependable Capacity	(Gross Mine): To	be det.		
 Maximum Dependable Capacity If Changes Occur in Capacity R 	17400 14 1101		e Last Report Give Re	asons:
				- y
9. Power Level To Which Restricte	ed. If Any (Net MWe	zero (u	ntil July 6, 19	79)
O. Reasons For Restrictions, If An		illetins and S	hutdown Orders	
7. Reasons For Restrictions, if An				
		This Month	Yrto-Date	Cumulative
		744	5,087	16,852
1. Hours In Reporting Period	California	498	2,245.4	8,877.2
2. Number Of Hours Reactor Was		264.2	1,876.4	2,666.7
3. Reactor Reserve Shutdown Hor	urs	479.8	2,154.9	7,888.1
4. Hours Generator On-Line	-	264.2	1,728.2	1,728.2
5. Unit Reserve Shutdown Hours	od (MWH)	1,230,451	5,109,548	15,297,118
 Gross Thermal Energy Generate Gross Electrical Energy Genera 		409,950	1,703,218	5.086,973
8. Net Electrical Energy Generate		381,814	1,594,372	4,635,832
9. Unit Service Factor	G (171711)	64.5	42.4	48.3
O. Unit Availability Factor		100	76.3	59.9
1. Unit Capacity Factor (Using M	DC Net)	To be det.		
2. Unit Capacity Factor (Using D		56.6	34.6	33.7
3. Unit Forced Outage Rate		0	3.8	21.3
4 Shutdowns Scheduled Over Ne	xt 6 Months (Type, I	Date, and Duration	of Each):	
4. Shutdowns Scheduled Over Ne	xt 6 Months (Type, I	Jate, and Duration	of Each):	-
5. If Shut Down At End Of Repo			P	Anklared
6. Units In Test Status (Prior to C	Commercial Operation	n):	Forecast	Achieved
INITIAL CR	ITICALITY			
INITIAL EL	ECTRICITY		-	-
COMMERCI	AL OPERATION		- AND THE PARTY NAMED IN	marris assessment

647 257 (9/77)

07 257

POOR ORIGINAL

UNIT SHUTDOWNS AND FOWER REDUCTIONS

REPORT MONTH July, 1979

DOCKET NO. UNIT NAME DATE August 7, 1979

COMPLETED BY TELEPHONE 259-5000 Ext. 236

No.	Date	Type1	Duration (Hours)	Reason?	Method of Shutting Down Reactor ³	Licensee Event Report #	System Code4	Component Code5	Cause & Corrective Action to Prevent Recurrence
9	79 03 30	S	264.2	D	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	The unit remained in an outage until July 12, 1979. Refer to the outage summary of July, 1979, for further details.

F: Forced S: Scheduled

Reason:

A-Equipment Failure (Explain)

B-Maintenance or Test

C-Refueling

D Regulatory Restriction

Operator Training & License Examination

F-Administrative

G Operational Error (Explain)

H Other (Explain)

Method:

1-Manual

2-Manual Scram.

3-Automatic Scrain.

4-Other (Explain)

4

Exhibit G - Instructions for Preparation of Data Entry Sheets for Licensee Event Report (LER) File (NUREG-0161)

5

Exhibit 1 - Same Source

(9/77)

500

OPERATIONAL SUMMARY FOR JULY, 1979

The unit outage, which began at 2142 hours on March 30, 1979, was in progress the first nine days of the month. The outage was extended longer than anticipated due to additional NRC startup restraints which were imposed as a result of an ongoing analysis of the Three Mile Island incident. NRC released the unit to go to Mode 3 on July 2, 1979, and the NRC shutdown order was lifted on July 6, 1979.

7/10/79	Reactor criticality was established at 2338 hours. At 2339 hours, the startup range nuclear instrument NI-1 failed and a reactor shutdown was initiated.
7/11/79	Reactor criticality was re-established at 0558 hours.
7/12/79	The turbine-generator was synchronized on line at 0011 hours. Reactor power was increased, but was administratively limited to 60%. This limitation was initiated to investigate an asymmetric rod fault for Rod 2 of Group 2.
7/13/79-7/16/79	Reactor power was increased to 90% on July 14, 1979, and maintained until July 16, 1979. Reactor power was increased to 100% full power at 2223 hours on July 16, 1979.
7/17/79 - 7/31/79	The unit was maintained between 99% and 100% reactor power the remainder of the month.

REFUELIN	G INF	ORMA	TION

Schedule		Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station Unit	
	d date for	next refueling shutdown: March, 1980	
Schedule	d date for	restart following refueling: May, 198	0
specific in generand core to deter	cation changeral, will the configurate mine whether	esumption of operation thereafter require or other license amendment? If answer ese be? If answer is no, has the reloadion been reviewed by your Flant Safety Rer any unreviewed safety questions are as f. 10 CFR Section 50.59)?	fuel design Review Committee
Yes, se	e attached		
الأسلسانية الم			
,			
		4	
			*
		or submitting proposed licensing action cember, 1979	and supporting
differe	nt fuel des	considerations associated with refueling or supplier, unreviewed design or per thanges in fuel design, new operating	rformance analy
differe	nt fuel des , significa	ign or supplier, unreviewed design or per it changes in fuel design, new operating	procedures.
different methods The spe	nt fuel des , significa nt f l poo	ign or supplier, unreviewed design or per it changes in fuel design, new operating capacity expansion program was approved	procedures. by the NRC in
different methods The spe	nt fuel des , significa nt f l poo	ign or supplier, unreviewed design or per it changes in fuel design, new operating	procedures. by the NRC in
different methods The spe	nt fuel des , significa nt f l poo	ign or supplier, unreviewed design or per it changes in fuel design, new operating capacity expansion program was approved	procedures. by the NRC in
different methods The spe	nt fuel des , significa nt f l poo	ign or supplier, unreviewed design or per it changes in fuel design, new operating capacity expansion program was approved	procedures. by the NRC in
differe methods The spe Amendme	nt fuel des, significant f 1 poont 19 to the	ign or supplier, unreviewed design or per it changes in fuel design, new operating capacity expansion program was approved	procedures. by the NRC in
differemethods The spe Amendme	nt fuel des, significant f 1 poont 19 to the	ign or supplier, unreviewed design or per it changes in fuel design, new operating capacity expansion program was approved coperating license received August 1, 19	procedures. by the NRC in
differemethods The spe Amendme The num storage (a)	nt fuel des, significant f 1 poonnt 19 to the ber of fuel pool.	assemblies (a) in the core and (b) in t (b) 0 (zero)	by the NRC in 79. he spent fuel
differemethods The spe Amendme The num storage (a) The pre	nt fuel des, significant f l poonnt f l poonnt 19 to the ber of fuel pool. 177 sent licens	assemblies (a) in the core and (b) in t (b) 0 (zero)	by the NRC in 79. the spent fuel the size of any
The num storage (a) The pre increas	nt fuel des, significant f l poolnt 19 to the ber of fuel pool. 177 sent license in licens	assemblies (a) in the core and (b) in to (b) 0 (zero) ed spent fuel pool storage capacity and ed storage capacity that has been request assemblies.	the size of any
The num storage (a) The pre increas	the fuel des , significant of 1 poot nt 19 to the ber of fuel pool. 177 sent licens e in licens er of fuel	assemblies (a) in the core and (b) in t (b) 0 (zero) ed spent fuel pool storage capacity and ed storage capacity that has been reques	the size of any

DATE: July, 1979

REFUELING INFORMATION (Continued)
July, 1979
Page 2 of 2

4. The following Technical Specifications (Part A) will require revision:

2.1.1 & 2.1.2 - Reactor Core Safety Limits (and Eases)

2.2.1 - Reactor Protection System Instrumentation Setpoints
(and Bases)

3.1.3.6 - Regulating Rod In . . . Limits

3.1.3.7 - Rod Program

3.2.1 - Axial Power Imbalance (and Bases)

The following Technical Specifications (Part A) may also require revision:

3.1.2.8 & 3.1.2.9 - Borated Water Sources (and Bases)

3.2.4 - Quadrant Power Tilt (and Bases)

3.2.5 - DNB Parameters (and Bases)

FCR NO: 79-151

SYSTEM: Service Water (SW) and Component Cooling Water (CCW)

COMPONENT Component Cooling Water Heat Exchanger Service Water Outlet Valves (SW 1424, SW 1429, SW 1434)

CHANGE, TEST, OR EXPERIMENT: On July 3, 1979, implementation of Facility Change Request 79-151 was completed. This change modified the actuator linkages on valves SW 1424, SW 1429, and SW 1434 to provide a more secure and positive attachment of the actuator linkage arms to the disk arms of the valves.

REASON FOR THE FCR: The retaining nut for the valve linkage was being loosened by vibration which caused slippage and misalignment of the valve operator linkage. See License Event Reports NP-33-79-74, NP-33-78-147, NP-33-78-120 for further details.

SAFETY EVALUATION: This change will prevent the head capscrew from backing out and the valve linkage from vibrating loose. The safety function of the service water system will not be adversely affected. This change is expected to increase the reliability of these service water valves. This is not an unreviewed safety question.

FCR NO: 79-170

S'.STEM: Reactor Protection System (RPS)

MPONENT: High Pressure Trip B1 table Setpoints

CHANGE, TEST, OR EXPERIMENT: On May 26, 1979, work was completed which readjusted the trip setpoints of the Reactor Protection System (RPS) from 2351.4 PSIG to 2296.4 PSIG. The system operating procedure, as well as the applicable surveillance test procedures, have been revised to reflect this change. A request for an amendment to Table 2.2-1 of the Davis-Besse Unit 1 Technical Specifications has been submitted in order to reflect the above change.

REASON FOR THE FCR: The reduction in the RPS high pressure trip setpoint was made to preclude actuation of the pressurizer Power Operated Relief Valve (PORV). This is in response to Nuclear Regulatory Commission Bulletin 79-05B.

SAFETY EVALUATION: The proposed reduction in the RPS high pressure trip setpoint does not degrade the safety of the plant and does not invalidate any of
the safety analyses presented in the Davis-Besse Unit 1 FSAR or in the safety
evaluation submitted to the NRC on December 22, 1978 (Serial No. 475). The
possibility of an accident or a malfunction of a different type than any evaluated in the FSAR is not created. Also, the margin of safety as defined in the
bases for technical specification is not reduced. Pursuant to the above, the
proposed change does not involve an unreviewed safety question. For further
details, see Toledo Edison response to NRC Bulletin 79-05B.

FCR NO: 79-244

SYSTEM: Main Steam

COMPONENT: Snubber mounts on both SR-7 seismic restraint locations

CHANGE, TEST, OR EXPERIMENT: On June 20, 1979, work was completed which extended the length of the snubber mountings on both SR-7 seismic restraint locations $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches. All applicable drawings were revised by the unit Architecht-Engineer Bechtel Company.

REASON FOR THE FCR: The former mounting arrangement caused these two snubbers to be completely extended when the piping was cold. This change placed these snubbers in the middle of their stroke when cold, as designed. These snubbers were operable and suill are operable when at normal operable temperature.

SAFETY EVALUATION: This change moves the mounting of the snubber such that it will be in the designed position with the piston properly centered. Therefore, operation of the snubber in the unlikely event of a seismic event will be as designed. This is not an unreviewed safety question.

FCR NO: 79-257

SYSTEM: Main Steam

COMPONENT: Seismic restraints SR-2, SR-4, SR-6, and SR-7

CHANGE, TEST, OR EXPERIMENT: On June 27, 1979, work was completed which added webb reinforcing plates to seismic restraints SR-2, SR-4, SR-6, and SR-7. Since seismic restraints to SR-2, SR-4, SR-6, and SR-7 are located on both main steam lines, a total of eight seismic restraint locations were affected. The necessity for addition of the web reinforcing plates to these eight seismic restraint locations was determined as a result of an investigation conducted by the unit architect/engineer, Bechtel Company. All affected drawings were revised to reflect the change.

REASON FOR FCR: A review of design calculations by Bechtel discovered a design deficiency in that the impact points of these eight seismic restraint locations could have deformed if a design basis earthquake had occured. The addition of the web reinforcing plates corrects this deficiency. (For further details, see dicense Event Report NP-32-79-08).

SAFETY EVALUATION: Bechtel Engineering evaluation of as-built seismic restraints on the main steam lines showed that eight seismic restraint locations (four on each main steam line) may be subject to I-beam web deformation. To prevent this web deformation, web stiffeners were welded to both sides of the I-beam web. This will stiffen the web and distribute the load, thus preventing web deformation. This modification will not degrade the safety function of the main steam system. This is not an unreviewed safety question.

FCR NO: 79-261

SYSTEM: Auxiliary Feed Water (AFW) System

COMPONENT: Auxiliary Feed Pumps and Turbines 1-1 and 1-2

CHANGE, TEST, OR EXPERIMENT: On June 28, 1979, a 72-hour endurance run of both auxiliary feedwater pumps was successfully completed. After a subsequent cooldown period, both pumps were restarted and run for one hour. This test was conducted with the unit in Mode 5. No water was pumped into the steam generators; pump discharge was to the station drainage system or back to the condensate storage tank.

REASON FOR THE FCR: The above mentioned test runs were made to fulfill an NRC commitment to verify the auxiliary feedwater pumps would operate properly for an extended period of time.

SAFETY EVALUATION: This test did not degrade the safety of the unit since it was conducted in Mode 5, and the AFW system is only required in Modes 1, 2, and 3. Also, a surveillance test has been conducted upon the system before the unit is started up in order to ensure its operability. This is not an unreviewed safety question.