



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 5 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-73

DUQUESNE LIGHT COMPANY
OHIO EDISON COMPANY
THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY
THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-412

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated June 22, 1988, Duquesne Light Company (the licensee, acting as agent for the above listed utilities) submitted a license amendment request involving the Technical Specifications (TS) for the Beaver Valley Power Station Unit No. 2. The licensee proposed to update the sections on pressurizer and main steam safety valves to reflect the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) requirements, revising the lift pressure setpoint tolerance on these valves from + 1% to + 1%, - 3%. The same changes have been granted to the Beaver Valley Unit 1 Technical Specifications by Amendment No. 115.

2.0 EVALUATION

The staff review of the licensee's request was performed in accordance with the guidelines of the Standard Review Plan Section 3.9.6 and the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section XI. The following proposed changes relating to the Technical Specifications for the pressurizer safety valves and main steam safety valves were reviewed:

- (1) Add a note in Sections 3.4.2, 3.4.3, and 3.7.1.1 to require resetting the valve to within $\pm 1\%$ of the pressure setpoint following testing.
- (2) Revise the surveillance requirements in Section 4.7.1.1 to read "No additional surveillance requirements other than those required by Specification 4.0.5."
- (3) Change the lift pressure setpoint tolerance from $\pm 1\%$ to + 1%, - 3% in Sections 3.4.2, 3.4.3, and 3.7.1.1.

All changes are consistent with the STS and do not violate any applicable staff guidelines.

In support of item (3), the licensee has provided technical bases for the revised setpoint tolerance of the safety valves. Under current Technical Specifications, if any valve fails to meet the + 1% set pressure tolerance, an additional sample of valves must be tested in accordance with IWV-3513, Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code. Changing the lift pressure setpoint tolerance to + 1%, - 3% would widen the allowable range of setpoint drift, shorten the time needed to perform the tests, and decrease man-rem exposure incurred during testing and maintenance.

In the design basis analyses, these valves are assumed to open at a pressure that is 1% above the setpoint. If the valve should lift at a lower pressure during a transient, the resultant peak pressure would be bounded by the limiting case that is based on the + 1% tolerance. Since the safety valves protect the primary and secondary systems from overpressure, the design basis safety margin corresponding to the current + 1% is therefore unchanged with the same upper tolerance of + 1%. We have determined that the proposed revision of the safety valve setpoint tolerance would have little safety significance and not alter any of the accident analyses.

Based on the considerations discussed above, we conclude that changes identified in the licensee's Request No. 8, dated June 22, 1988, are acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment changes a requirement with respect to the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20, and changes certain surveillance requirements. 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. We have 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.

4.0 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: **SEP 23 1988**

Principal Contributor:

Peter S. Tam