

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 10 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)(n) 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:

"Prior to startup following the first (1st) regularly scheduled refueling outage, Toledo Edison Company shall install flow measuring devices to measure at least 40 gpm for boron dilution when the plant is operating in either the hot leg drain mode or the pressurizer spray mode."

DISCUSSION

We stated in Section 6.3.3.4 of Supplement No. 1 to the Safety Evaluation Report that we had reviewed the licensee's proposed procedures and the plant systems designed for preventing excessive boric acid buildup in the reactor vessel during the long term cooling period after a postulated loss-of-coolant accident.

From our review and evaluation of the licensee's proposed procedures and system design for mitigating boric acid precipitation, we determined that the licensee would be required to demonstrate by preoperational tests that a minimum flow of 40 gallons per minute of water would be available to provide dilution of the water in the upper plenum of the reactor vessel when the plant was either in the hot leg drain mode or the pressurizer spray mode. Also, we stated that the licensee would be required to install flow rate measuring devices for assuring that a minimum of 40 gallons per minute of water was available for either mode following a loss-of-coolant accident. As stated in Condition 2.C. 3)(n), the flow measuring devices were to be installed prior to startup following the first regularly scheduled refueling outage.

OFFICE →						
SURNAME →						
DATE →						

We concluded in Section 6.3.3.4 of Supplement No. 1 that acceptable results from the preoperational tests would provide reasonable assurance that the system would deliver the minimum flow if needed during the period prior to startup following the first scheduled refueling outage.

EVALUATION

On August 26, 1977, the Office of Inspection and Enforcement informed us that the licensee had acceptably completed the Boron Dilution Mode Tests as stipulated in Item F.4 in Attachment 2 to Facility License NPF-3.

On December 29, 1977, the licensee informed us that they had installed the flow rate measuring devices in accordance with the stipulations of Condition 2.C.(3)(n). By letter dated May 19, 1978, the Office of Inspection and Enforcement informed us that they had inspected and verified that flow measuring devices had been installed to measure from 0 to 60 gallons per minute in the control room, and were seismically qualified, calibrated and tested.

Based upon our conclusions as stated in our Safety Evaluation Report for Davis Besse, Unit 1 and upon installation of the flow rate measuring devices by the licensee, which have been verified by the Office of Inspection and Enforcement to be in accordance with the stipulations of Condition 2.C.(3)(n), we find that Condition 2.C.(3)(n) is no longer necessary. Therefore, we conclude that Facility Operating License No. NPF-3 can be amended by removing license Condition 2.C.(3)(n).

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.

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

We concluded in Section 6.3.3.4 of Supplement No. 1 that acceptable results from the preoperational tests would provide reasonable assurance that the system would deliver the minimum flow if needed during the period prior to startup following the first scheduled refueling outage.

EVALUATION

On August 26, 1977, the Office of Inspection and Enforcement informed us that the licensee had acceptably completed the Boron Dilution Mode Tests as stipulated in Item F.4 in Attachment 2 to Facility License NPF-3.

On December 29, 1977, the licensee informed us that they had installed the flow rate measuring devices in accordance with the stipulations of Condition 2.C.(3)(n). By letter dated May 19, 1978, the Office of Inspection and Enforcement informed us that they had inspected and verified that flow measuring devices had been installed to measure from 0 to 60 gallons per minute in the control room, and were seismically qualified, calibrated and tested in accordance with the Boron Dilution Mode Tests defined by Item F.4, Attachment 2 to Facility License NPF-3.

Based upon our conclusions as stated in our Safety Evaluation Report for Davis Besse, Unit 1 and upon installation of the flow rate measuring devices by the licensee, which have been verified by the Office of Inspection and Enforcement to be in accordance with the stipulations of Condition 2.C.(3)(n), we find that Condition 2.C.(3)(n) is no longer necessary. Therefore, we conclude that Facility Operating License No. NPF-3 can be amended by removing license Condition 2.C.(3)(n).

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.

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

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.

Date: MAY 26 1978

BF Engle *(see comment on 2)*

OFFICE	LWR	LWR-1			
SURNAME	LEngle/red	JStolz			
DATE	5/16/78	5/16/78	5/13/78		