



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

AMENDMENT NO. 75 TO LICENSE NO. DPR-44  
AND  
AMENDMENT NO. 74 TO LICENSE NO. DPR-56

PEACH BOTTOM ATOMIC POWER STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3

PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY

DOCKETS NOS. 50-277 AND 50-278

I. INTRODUCTION

By letter dated August 8, 1980, Philadelphia Electric Company (licensee) proposed amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-44 and DPR-56 for the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units Nos. 2 and 3. The amendments would revise the Technical Specifications by adding operability and surveillance requirements for seismic monitoring instrumentation. The licensee's application is in response to our request dated July 1, 1980.

II. EVALUATION

By our letter dated July 1, 1980, we indicated to the licensee that a review of the Technical Specifications for Peach Bottom 2 and 3 reflected that they did not include Limiting Conditions for Operation or Surveillance Requirements for seismic instrumentation. We requested that the licensee propose appropriate Technical Specifications so that verification of his conformance with the requirements of Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 100 could be assured. In response to our request the licensee indicated that a new seismic monitoring system which would comply with the guidelines of Regulatory Guide 1.12 was initiated in the spring of 1980; delivery was expected in September 1980; and the equipment would be operational by the fall of 1980. The system to be installed consists of four (4) triaxial time-history accelerographs, three (3) triaxial peak accelerographs, and a triaxial response-spectrum recorder. On September 24, 1980, we discussed, via telephone, the proposed system. The licensee stated that the response-spectrum recorder located in the cable spreading room has two sets of sensors associated with it: one triaxial time-history and one response-spectrum monitor, both located on the containment foundation. This information was documented in the licensee's letter dated October 3, 1980. Based on this information, we have determined that the proposed system is in conformance with our position set forth in Regulatory Guide 1.12 and is therefore acceptable. We suggested to the licensee that the triaxial response-spectrum recorder description be included in the bases to clearly demonstrate consistency with Regulatory Guide 1.12 regulatory position. He agreed.

The licensee's submittal of Limiting Conditions for Operation for this equipment and associated Surveillance Requirements is consistent with current licensing practice as set forth in NUREG-0123, "Standard Technical Specifications for General Electric Boiling Water Reactors". Accordingly, the licensee's submittal, as amended by the staff, is acceptable.

### III. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

We have determined that the amendments do 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 amendments involve 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 these amendments.

### IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendments do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and do not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendments do not involve a significant hazard 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 these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: November 19, 1980