



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 59 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-66

DUQUESNE LIGHT COMPANY

OHIO EDISON COMPANY

PENNSYLVANIA POWER COMPANY

BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-334

Introduction

By letter dated July 30, 1982, Duquesne Light Company (the licensee) proposed to amend its Facility Operating License DPR-66 for Beaver Valley, Unit No. 1, by submitting a revision to the Technical Specifications.

The licensee proposed to modify Table 3.3-6 entitled, "Radiation Monitoring Instrumentation," of Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCO) 3.3.3, and Table 4.3-3 entitled, "Radiation Monitoring Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements," of Surveillance Requirement 4.3.3. He also proposed to modify the Bases for Section 3/4.3.3.1.

Discussion

The licensee proposed that Table 3.3-6 be expanded to include the containment area radiation monitors and the noble gas effluent monitors which monitor the supplemental leak collection and release system, the auxiliary building ventilation system, the process vent system, the atmospheric steam dump valve and code safety relief valve discharge, and the auxiliary feedwater pump turbine exhaust. These monitors were proposed for addition as a part of the implementation of TMI Action Plan Requirements, Attachments 1, 2, and 3 of Item II.F.1 of NUREG-0737. The licensee also proposed to modify Table 4.3-3 so that the surveillance requirements of this Table would be expanded to include the monitors proposed for addition to Table 3.3-6. He also proposed that the Bases for Section 3/4.3.3.1 be revised to reflect the additional capability of the new instrumentation to monitor various plant areas and process systems and for the revised Bases to indicate that this capability was in response to the requirements of NUREG-0737.

Evaluation

We have reviewed the licensee's proposed changes against the guidance provided by Item II.F.1, Attachments 1-3 of NUREG-0737. The range of the noble gas effluent monitors are consistent with the recommendations of Table II.F.1-1. The licensee did not file any request for deviations from the position of II.F.1, Attachment 2,

8211220376 821110
PDR ADOCK 05000334
P PDR

or to the clarification associated with this attachment. Therefore, we find that the system meets the guidance of II.F.1, Attachment 2. The licensee should have available for review, by NRC inspectors, the final design details of the implementation of the position and clarification of Attachment 2. It should be noted that the releases from the atmospheric steam dump valves, the code safety relief valves, and the auxiliary feedwater turbine exhausts will not be sampled for radioiodines and particulates due to the high steam content in the release.

We have reviewed the addition of the containment high-range radiation monitors to Tables 3.3-6 and 4.3-3 and have determined that the addition of these monitors is in accordance with Attachment 3 of Item II.F.1 and the Standard Technical Specifications.

We have determined that the licensee needs to add the noble gas effluent monitors associated with the auxiliary feedwater turbine exhaust and the atmospheric steam dump valve and code safety relief valve discharge to Table 2.4-4 of the Environmental Technical Specifications. We have discussed this addition with the licensee and he concurs with this recommendation. With this addition, the proposed changes to Tables 3.3-6 and 4.3-3, and the Bases of Section 3/4.3.3.1 are considered acceptable.

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 an accident previously evaluated, does not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, and does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, the amendment 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.

Dated: November 10, 1982

Principal Contributors

J. J. Hayes
R. Serbu