

**JUL 21 1977**

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 5 TO LICENSE NO. NPF-3

TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

AND

CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY

DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. 50-346

INTRODUCTION

Paragraph 2.C.(3)(c) of facility operating license No. NPF-3 for the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, issued on April 22, 1977, stipulates as a condition to the license that:

"Within three (3) months of the date of issuance of this license, Toledo Edison Company shall have installed a second oxygen monitor in the gaseous waste system to provide redundant oxygen monitors that will alarm locally and in the control room at the set points of two percent and four percent by volume of oxygen, respectively."

DISCUSSION

In our review and evaluation of the Final Safety Analysis Report for Davis-Besse, Unit 1, we determined that the design of the gaseous radwaste treatment system was unacceptable regarding the monitoring of potentially explosive mixtures of hydrogen and oxygen. By letters dated October 29, 1977 and November 5, 1977, we informed the Toledo Edison Company that it was our position that the gaseous radwaste treatment system must be provided with a second oxygen monitor to provide redundant oxygen monitors for the system and that these monitors would be required to alarm locally and in the control room at the set points of two percent and four percent by volume of oxygen. Also, upon alarm of either or both monitors, immediate action was to be taken to reduce the oxygen concentration in the gaseous radwaste system to safe levels.

EVALUATION

On November 23, 1976, the Toledo Edison Company submitted Amendment No. 39 consisting of Revision No. 23 to the Final Safety Analysis Report. Revision No. 23 included proposed modifications in the gaseous radwaste treatment system. The proposed modifications represented a commitment on behalf of the Toledo Edison Company to meet our position as stated in our letter of November 5, 1977 regarding these matters. Also, the Toledo Edison Company stated that the proposed modifications would be installed and operational by June 1977.

8001230 573

JUL 21 1977

- 2 -

As stated in Section 11.3 of our Safety Evaluation Report, we reviewed the proposed modified gaseous radwaste system, and we found it to be acceptable. Also, we reaffirm our conclusions as stated in our Safety Evaluation Report, that we find the modified gaseous radwaste treatment system to be in conformance with 10 CFR Part 20 for effluent releases and, therefore, acceptable.

On June 24, 1977, the Toledo Edison Company informed us that the modified system had been installed and completed and was in conformance with the conditions of Paragraph 2.C.(3)(c). On the same day we requested that the Office of Inspection and Enforcement verify that the modified gaseous radwaste treatment system had been installed to the conditions specified in Paragraph 2.C.(3)(c).

By letter dated July 7, 1977, the Office of Inspection and Enforcement informed us that the second oxygen monitor had been installed and set in accordance to Paragraph 2.C.(3)(c).

Based upon our conclusions as stated in our Safety Evaluation Report and upon the installation of the modified gaseous radwaste treatment system by the Toledo Edison Company, which has been verified by the Office of Inspection and Enforcement to be in accordance with the stipulations of Paragraph 2.C.(3)(c), we find that the condition stipulated in Paragraph 2.C.(3)(c) is no longer necessary. Therefore, we conclude that facility operating license, No. NPF-3 can be amended by removing the license condition as stated in Paragraph 2.C.(3)(c).

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

#### CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered or a significant decrease in any safety margin, it does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public. Also, we reaffirm our conclusions as otherwise stated in our Safety Evaluation Report.