



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION SUPPORTING
AMENDMENTS NOS. 88 AND 88 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSES NOS. DPR-44 AND DPR-56

PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY
PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY
DELMARVA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY
ATLANTIC CITY ELECTRIC COMPANY

PEACH BOTTOM ATOMIC POWER STATION, UNITS NOS. 2 AND 3

DOCKETS NOS. 50-277 AND 50-278

Introduction

By letter dated October 14, 1980, as supplemented October 7, 1981, the Philadelphia Electric Company (the licensee) proposed an amendment to the Technical Specifications (TSs) appended to Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-44 and DPR-56. The proposed amendment would provide surveillance requirements for scram discharge volume (SDV) vent and drain valves and limiting conditions for operation/surveillance requirements for reactor protection system (RPS) and control block SDV limit switches.

Background

As a result of events involving common cause failures of SDV limit switches and SDV drain valve operability, the NRC staff issued IE Bulletin 80-14 on June 12, 1980. In addition, the NRC staff sent a letter dated July 7, 1980, to all operating BWR licensees requesting that they propose TS changes to provide surveillance requirements for SDV vent and drain valves and limiting conditions for operation/surveillance requirements on SDV limit switches. Model TSs were enclosed with this letter to provide guidance to licensees for preparation of the requested submittals.

Evaluation

The enclosed Technical Evaluation Report (TER-C5506-68/72) was prepared for us by Franklin Research Center (FRC) as part of our technical assistance contract program. Their report provides their technical evaluation of the compliance of the licensee's submittal with NRC provided criteria.

FRC has concluded that the licensee's response does not meet the explicit requirements of paragraph 3.3-6 and Table 3.3.6-1 of the NRC staff's Model TSs. However, the FRC report concludes that technical bases are defined on p. 50 of the staff's "Generic Safety Evaluation Report BWR Scram Discharge System," December 1, 1980 for this departure from the explicit requirements of the Model TSs.

A summary of the evaluation for those areas where the licensee's response represents a departure from the explicit requirements of the Model TSs is provided below:

The alarm and rod block instrumentation, consisting of one operable instrument channel with one limit switch for control rod withdrawal block as specified on the revised TS page 73, is acceptable because the licensee's long term modification of the scram discharge system provides for an adequate and acceptable hydraulic coupling between scram discharge headers and instrumented volume.

Because the "Scram Discharge Volume Scram Trips" cannot be bypassed at the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, while the reactor is in operational conditions of startup and run, and interlocks are provided which prevent the withdrawal of more than one control rod with the mode switch in the refuel position, the Model TSs (paragraph 3.3.6, Table 3.3.6-1, paragraph 4.3.6 and Table 4.3.6-1) are, therefore, not applicable for "Trip Function 5b, SDV Scram Trip Bypassed."

We conclude that these technical bases justify a deviation from the explicit requirements of the Model TSs.

FRC has concluded that the licensee's proposed TS revisions meet our criteria without the need for further revision.

Summary

Based upon our review of the contractor's report and discussions with the reviewer, we conclude that the licensee's proposed TSs satisfy our requirements for surveillance of SDV vent and drain valves and for limiting conditions for operation/surveillance requirements for SDV limit switches. Consequently, we find the licensee's proposed TSs acceptable for Peach Bottom Units 2 and 3.

Environmental Consideration

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.

Conclusion

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 an accident previously evaluated, do not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, and do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, the amendments do 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 these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: March 1, 1983

Enclosure:

TER

The following NRC personnel have contributed to this Safety Evaluation:
Gerry Gears, Ken Eccleston.