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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 148 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-66
AMENDMENT NO. 25 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-73

DUQUESNE LIGHT COMPANY
OHIO EDISON COMPANY
PENNSYLVANIA POWER COMPANY
THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY
THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-334 AND 50-412

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated June 29, 1989, Duquesne Light Company (the licensee, acting as agent for the above utilities) submitted a request to amend the Beaver Valley Power Station, Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications in a number of miscellaneous areas. Our evaluation of these proposed changes follows.

DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION

(1) Specifications 4.1.2.3.2 and 4.1.2.3.3.c (Unit 1 only)

A footnote has been added to specification 4.1.2.3.2 to adopt the same wording from the Unit 2 Technical Specification. The new * footnote specifies that an inoperable charging pump may be energized for testing, provided steps are taken to prevent actual flow into the reactor coolant system. The previous Specification 4.1.2.3.2 and footnote did not provide any conditions under which the pump can be tested. The new footnote provides operational flexibility (i.e., maintenance) but still assures that no more than one charging train can provide flow to the reactor coolant system. No previous safety analyses are affected. We find this change acceptable.

Specification 4.1.2.3.3.c has been revised by deleting the footnote *, which represented a condition that no longer exists. This specification is thus simplified by eliminating any reference to "MOV-ISI-890C". The remaining wording simply requires that a low-head safety injection flow path from the refueling water storage tank to the reactor coolant system be verified once per shift. This is in compliance with the guidance of Generic Letter 88-17, identical to existing wording already in the Unit 2 Technical Specifications, and is acceptable.

(2) Table 4.3-6 and 4.3-7 (Unit 1 only)

A notation incorrectly referenced "Surveillance Requirement 4.7.1.2.a.9". The referenced specification should be "Surveillance Requirement 4.7.1.2.c". This change is editorial and is acceptable.

(3) Specification 3.3.3.8.a (Unit 2 only)

The reference to "Specification 3.4.11.a" was incorrect. The correct reference is "Specification 3.4.11". This change is editorial and is acceptable.

(4) Table 3.3-13

Action 31 has been revised to reflect the Standard Technical Specifications (STS). The previous statement required grab sampling when one channel of the Waste Gas Decay Tank Oxygen Monitor is inoperable but did not provide any guidance when two channels are inoperable. The STS action statement provides separate requirements when one channel is inoperable and also when both channels are inoperable.

In addition, incorporating the STS action statement will reduce the sampling required by the previous action statement when only one channel is inoperable. The change does not affect any previous safety analysis, and complies with our current position in the STS. This change is acceptable.

(5) Specification 4.5.1.3

A * note has been added to this surveillance requirement to allow opening the accumulator discharge isolation valves when RCS pressure is less than 1000 ± 100 psig. Associated bases 3/4.5.1 has also been revised to provide the reason for opening the valves. The accumulator discharge isolation valves must be opened to perform accumulator discharge check valve testing in accordance with Inservice Testing Program (IST). This testing will be performed when the accumulator pressure is less than the reactor vessel low temperature overpressure protection setpoint to ensure the accumulator pressure will not challenge the cold overpressure protection system or exceed the 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix G limits. Therefore, this change will not affect any previous safety analysis but provides operational flexibility. It is acceptable.

(6) Specification 4.6.2.1.b (Unit 1 only)

This specification has been revised to conform with the Unit 2 wording for quench spray pump testing. The IST program has been updated to the 1983 ASME Section XI code which requires pump testing quarterly. The monthly quench spray pump tests described in Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) Section 6.4.2 were based on the old ASME code edition. The proposed changes will not affect the FSAR accident analysis or any regulatory basis, and is acceptable.

(7) Specification 3.7.1.5 (Unit 1 only)

Regarding the Main Steam Isolation Valves (MSIVs), the Mode 1 Action statement has been revised to address an inoperable but open MSIV and requires its restoration to operable status within 4 hours, or be in hot shutdown within the next 12 hours. The Mode 2 and 3 action statement has been revised to remove applicability to Mode 1 since the above action statement already applied to Mode 1. These changes will reduce the previous confusion and is consistent with the Unit 2 Technical Specifications and the STS. The changes are acceptable.

(8) Specification 4.9.8.1

This specification has been separated into items a and b to clarify the required surveillance frequencies. For item a the RHR flow rate will be verified greater than or equal to 1000 gpm twice per shift when the RCS is drained to a level lower than three feet below the reactor vessel flange. For item b the RHR flow rate will be verified greater than or equal to 3000 gpm before the start of and once per hour during a reduction in RCS boration concentration. The surveillance frequency for item a is consistent with the licensee's commitment in response to Generic Letter 88-17, and is thus acceptable. The surveillance frequency for item b was corrected to conform with the frequency provided in Specification 3.1.1.3, and is acceptable. The Unit 2 * note has been deleted since that note referred to conditions prior to initial criticality. That note no longer applies; its elimination is purely editorial and is acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendments change requirements with respect to the installation or use of facility components located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and change surveillance requirements. We have determined that the amendments involve no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. We have previously issued a proposed finding that these amendments involve no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, these amendments meet 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 these amendments.

CONCLUSION

We have 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, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and (3) the issuance of these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: January 3, 1990

Principal Contributor:

P. Tam