

JUN 14 1977

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO LICENSE NO. NPF-3

TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

AND

CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY

DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. 50-346

POOR  
ORIGINAL

INTRODUCTION

We stated in Section 5.2.2 of Supplement 1 to the Safety Evaluation Report issued on April 22, 1977, that we would require the licensee to ensure that the decay heat removal relief valve actuate prior to the automatic closure of the decay heat removal isolation valves DH 11 and DH 12.

Paragraph 2C.(3)(o) of the Davis-Besse, Unit 1 facility operating license, No. NPF-3, stipulates as a condition that:

"Prior to entering Mode 2 (Startup), Toledo Edison Company shall submit for staff evaluation and subsequently implement the necessary modification to ensure that the decay heat removal relief valve will actuate prior to automatic closure of the decay heat removal system isolation valves."

DISCUSSION

By letter dated May 2, 1977, the licensee stated that the automatic closure setpoint of the decay heat removal system isolation valves DH 11 and DH 12 is being raised to not less than 413 pounds per square inch gauge which is 93 pounds per square inch gauge above the decay heat removal valve setpoint of 320 pounds per square inch gauge. Also, the licensee's determination of the automatic closure setpoints included margins for instrument accuracy, setpoint tolerance, instrument drift and relief valve accumulation.

EVALUATION

We have evaluated the licensee's commitment for the automatic closure setpoints and have determined from our review that the 93 pounds per square inch gauge pressure differential between the setpoints of the isolation valves and the relief valve provides adequate assurance that the decay heat removal relief valve

8001230 581

OFFICE →						
SURNAME →						
DATE →						

601220

# POOR ORIGINAL

- 2 -

will actuate prior to automatic closure of the decay heat removal system isolation valves.

Based on our review of the licensee's commitment for the automatic closure setpoints as stated above, we conclude that adequate assurance will be provided for assuring that the decay heat removal relief valve will actuate prior to automatic closure of the decay heat removal system isolation valves and this provision is acceptable to minimize the likelihood of exceeding the pressure limits of Appendix G to 10 CFR Part 50 for the first fuel cycle.

We therefore conclude that the limitations on plant operations as specified in Paragraph 2C.(3)(o) to the facility operating license, NPF-3, are no longer necessary and that the facility operating license, NPF-3, issued on April 22, 1977 can be amended by removing the license condition, stated in Paragraph 2C.(3)(o) which temporarily limited operation of Davis-Besse, Unit 1 to Mode 3 (hot standby).

#### 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.

JUN 14 1977

Dated:

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						