



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-3

TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

AND

CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY

DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. 50-346

Introduction

By letter dated November 5, 1982 and modified by letters dated July 1 and August 18, 1983, Toledo Edison Company (TED) transmitted a Technical Specification Change Request to amend Appendix A of Facility Operating License NPF-3. The change under consideration is Item 5 of the last submittal which modifies Sections 3.0.3 and 4.0.3 and adds Section 3.0.5. The safety function of Section 3.0.3 and 3.0.5 is to provide for shutdown of the unit due to equipment inoperability which places the plant outside the Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) and into applicable Action Statements. Section 4.0.3 provides guidance in the determination of equipment/system operability in the event of missed surveillance tests.

Evaluation

Section 3.0.3 of the Davis-Besse Technical Specifications (TSs) requires the plant to be placed in Hot Standby (Mode 3) within one hour of the time that an LCO and/or associated action requirements cannot be satisfied. The Babcock and Wilcox Standard Technical Specifications (STS), NUREG-0103, Rev. 4, requires that action be initiated in one hour to place the plant into Hot Standby within the next six hours, into Hot Shutdown in the following six hours, and into Cold Shutdown within the subsequent 24 hours. TECO proposes to use the STS paragraph to replace Section 3.0.3 since the plant cannot be shutdown from high power levels to the Hot Standby Mode in a controlled manner within one hour. The proposed action times are identical with those in the STS except TED elected to change 3.0.3.1 to read, "At least Hot Standby within 6 hours" in place of "At least Hot Standby within the next 6 hours", thus requiring the time to Hot Standby to be 6 hours as compared to 7 hours required by STS. The proposed change is in the conservative direction from STS.

On August 31, 1983, EG&G Idaho provided a Technical Evaluation Report (TER) of the licensee submittal of July 1, 1983. The report concludes that the proposed amendment provides adequate clarification of the term OPERABLE as it applies to engineered safety features systems to support system outages of redundant components.

8408020174 840709
PDR ADOCK 05000346
P PDR

Section 4.0.3 provides guidance in the determination of equipment/system operability in the event of missed surveillance tests. The proposed modification to Section 4.0.3 makes Section 4.0.3 identical to that in the B&W STS. TED proposes to add 4.0.3.1 to this section clarifying the actions required when a surveillance with monthly frequency or greater is missed due to administrative error. The addition of Section 4.0.3.1 will be reviewed and evaluated in a separate action.

We concur with the conclusions of the TER and agree that the proposed changes clarify the TSs and do not compromise safety of the plant. Therefore, the proposed changes are acceptable.

Environmental Consideration

This amendment involves a change in the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. We have determined that the amendment involves 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. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets 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 this amendment.

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 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: July 18, 1984

Principal contributor:
K. R. Ridgway