



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION SUPPORTING  
AMENDMENTS NOS. 117 AND 121 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

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated July 17, 1985, Philadelphia Electric Company (the licensee) requested amendments to the Technical Specifications (TSs) (Appendix A of Operating License Nos. DPR-44 and DPR-56) for Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, to permit bypassing of a scram signal for main steam isolation or main condenser vacuum while not in the "RUN" mode without a reactor pressure restriction.

2.0 EVALUATION

Currently, Table 3.1.1, Table 4.1.1 and the supporting Definitions and Bases paragraphs in the Peach Bottom TSs permit the scram signals associated with main steam isolation and low main condenser vacuum to be bypassed when not in "RUN" concurrent with reactor pressure less than 600 psig. The licensee proposes to eliminate the pressure restriction so that the scram signals from main steam isolation and low condenser vacuum are always bypassed when the mode selector switch is in the "REFUEL," the "START/HOT STANDBY," or the "SHUTDOWN" position. The licensee states that the existing logic with the pressure restriction on the bypass for the two scram signals mentioned above was included in the design not as a limiting safety system setting, but to compensate for operational difficulties observed at BWR plants of an earlier design. The licensee submits the test results documented in General Electric Report No. NEDO-20697, "Bottled-up Operation of a BWR," dated November 1974 to support the conclusion that the pressure restriction on the scram bypass can be deleted. The licensee also notes that the Standard Technical Specifications for General Electric Boiling Water Reactors, NUREG-0123, do not include the scram bypass pressure restriction.

We have reviewed the proposed changes to the Peach Bottom TSs and have compared the changes with the Plant Safety Analysis presented in Chapter 14 of the Peach Bottom Updated FSAR. No instance was identified where credit was taken in any of the plant transient or accident scenarios for a scram initiated by the current bypass logic due to pressure. Also a review of two recently licensed BWRs similar in design to the Peach Bottom units indicate that both plants are permitted by their TSs to bypass the scram signals for main steam isolation and condenser low vacuum when not in "RUN" without any pressure restriction.

A review of the SERs of two other BWRs in advanced states of licensing, which are also similar in design to the Peach Bottom units, determined that neither design included a pressure restriction on the scram signal bypass when not in "RUN." On the basis of our review of the licensee's submittal, including NEDO-20697, as well as the current licensing basis as exhibited in the four cases stated above, we find the licensee's requested changes to be acceptable.

The licensee has also proposed to delete obsolete footnotes. These footnotes are obsolete since they reference modifications and testing which have been completed. We find these deletions to be administrative in nature and, therefore, to be acceptable.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

These amendments involve changes in requirements with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. We have determined that the amendments involve 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 these amendments involve no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, these amendments meet 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 these amendments.

### 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 these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: March 14, 1986

Principal Contributor: James E. Beall, DRP, Region I