

PLANT SYSTEMS

3/4.7.3 COMPONENT COOLING WATER SYSTEM

LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERAT: . _____

3.7.3.1 At least two component cooling water subsystems shall be OPERABLE.

APPLICABILITY: MODES 1, 2, 3 and 4.

ACTION:

With less than two component cooling water subsystems OPERABLE, restore at least two subsystems to OPERABLE status within 72 hours or be in at least HOT STANDBY within the next 6 hours and in COLD SHUTDOWN within the following 30 hours.

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.7.3.1 At least two component cooling water subsystems shall be demonstrated OPERABLE.

- a. At least once per 31 days on a STAGGERED TEST BASIS by:
 - 1. Verifying that each pump develops the required differential pressure and flow rate when tested in accordance with the requirements of Section 4.0.5.
 - 2. Cycling each testable power operated or automatic valve servicing safety related equipment through at least one complete cycle of full travel.
 - 3. Verifying that each valve (manual, power operated or automatic) servicing safety related equipment that is not locked, sealed, or otherwise secured in position, is in its correct position.
- b. At least once per 18 months during shutdown, by cycling each power operated valve servicing safety related equipment that is not testable during plant operation, through at least one complete cycle of full travel.

PLANT SYSTEMS

3/4.7.4 REACTOR PLANT RIVER WATER SYSTEM (RPRWS)

LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION

3.7.4.1 At least two reactor plant river water subsystems supplying safety-related equipment shall be OPERABLE.

APPLICABILITY: MODES 1, 2, 3 and 4.

ACTION:

With less than two RPRWS subsystems OPERABLE, restore at least two subsystems to OPERABLE status within 72 hours or be in at least HOT STANDBY within the following 30 hours.

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.7.4.1 At least two RPRW subsystems shall be demonstrated OPERABLE:

- a. At least once per 31 days on a STAGGERED TEST BASIS by:
 1. Verifying that each pump develops the required differential pressure and flow rate when tested in accordance with the requirements of Section 4.0.5.
 2. Cycling each testable power operated or automatic valve servicing safety related equipment through at least one complete cycle of full travel.
 3. Verifying that each valve (manual, power operated or automatic) servicing safety related equipment that is not locked, sealed, or otherwise secured in position, is in its correct position.
- b. At least once per 18 months during shutdown, by cycling each power operated valve servicing safety related equipment that is not testable during plant operation, through at least one complete cycle of full travel.

ATTACHMENT B

Safety Evaluation

Proposed Change Request No. 92 amends the Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 1 Technical Specifications, Appendix A to clarify the reactor plant component cooling and river water pump surveillance requirements.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment requests a revision to the reactor plant component and river water pump surveillance requirements. The proposed surveillance requirements will require verification that each pump develops the required differential pressure and flow rate when tested in accordance with Specification 4.0.5. This will provide clarification of the pump testing requirements and require verification of parameters consistent with ASME Section XI.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 CFR 14870). One example of an amendment that is considered not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is "(i) A purely administrative change to the technical specifications; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature". The existing reactor plant component cooling water and river water pump surveillance requirements are inconsistent with the ASME Section XI pump testing requirements required by Specification 4.0.5. Violation of the existing technical specification surveillance requirements while maintaining compliance with ASME Section XI testing requirements is possible. Our existing surveillance requirements reflect the early standard technical specification testing requirements which did not include specification 4.0.5, pump testing was specified in the individual system surveillance requirements. Specification 4.0.5 was incorporated in later versions of the standard technical specifications and pump testing was removed from the individual system surveillance requirements. Specification 4.0.5 was incorporated into our technical specifications, however, the pump testing was never removed from the individual system surveillance requirements to reflect the standard technical specification revisions.

The UFSAR Section 9.4.5, CCR Tests and Inspections, states that the CCR system is in continuous operation and performance tests are not required. The UFSAR Section 9.9.4, RPRW Tests and Inspections, states that the major portion of the river water system is in continual use and requires no periodic testing. The proposed surveillance requirements involve pump performance testing as does the existing surveillance requirements; however, the proposed requirements verify differential pressure in lieu of discharge pressure, consistent with ASME Section XI. The UFSAR and standard technical specification surveillance requirements do not require pump performance testing. This differs from the proposed surveillance requirements which verify required differential pressure and flow rate for each pump when tested in accordance with Specifica-

tion 4.0.5. This was incorporated to provide additional assurance that system pressure and flow requirements are consistent with accident analysis assumptions and ASME Section XI. The proposed changes are not a safety concern since a change in nomenclature, to verify pump differential pressure, will not affect the operation of the pumps and measurement of pumps differential pressure and flow rate provides adequate indication of degradation in pump performance. Therefore, based on the above example, it is proposed that the change be characterized as involving no significant hazards consideration.