



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NOS. 130 AND 6

TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NOS. DPR-66 AND NPF-73

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

BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-334 AND 50-412

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated June 27, 1988, Duquesne Light Company (the licensee, acting as agent for the above-listed utilities), requested a number of changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) of Beaver Valley Power Station Units 1 and 2. We have reviewed the submittal and results of our review are as follows.

DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION

A. Safety Injection Input Test Frequency (Unit 1 only)

The surveillance frequency for Table 4.3-1 item 19, regarding safety injection input to the reactor trip system has been changed from "monthly" to "refueling" for clarification of the required instrumentation testing frequency. Previously, the manual ESF input was required to be tested every 18 months (i.e., every refueling) as specified by note (4), and the automatic SI input to the reactor trip logic was separately required to be tested monthly on a staggered basis in accordance with item 22. Therefore, item 19 previously only applied to the manual ESF input which was required to be tested every 18 months. The change does not alter any surveillance frequency and amounts to only an editorial change.

This change is consistent with the Unit 2 Technical Specifications and does not affect the FSAR or any regulatory basis. The change is thus acceptable.

B. Auxiliary Feedwater (AFW) Initiating Signal (both units)

The motor-driven pump of the AFW system of each unit can be initiated by one of a number of signals, including the turbine-driven-pump-discharge-pressure-low signal. The latter signal, however, is one that was not credited for actuation

8810030187 880923  
PDR ADOCK 05000334  
PNU

of the motor-driven pump in any safety analysis in the FSAR. Despite this fact, the licensee requested that this signal be added to the Technical Specifications to provide a comprehensive list of AFW actuation signals and Amendment No. 90, dated January 27, 1985 was granted to this effect to Unit 1. Unit 2's Technical Specification simply followed Unit 1's.

Deletion of the subject signal from Tables 3.3-3, 3.3-4 and 3.3-5 for both units' Technical Specifications does not have any effect on any safety analysis or the performance of the AFW system. The requested change is thus acceptable. With the deletion of the subject entry, other items are editorially renumbered in these Tables.

C. Surveillance Requirement for Residual Heat Removal (RHR) Pump Testing (both units)

The surveillance requirement for RHR pump testing has been revised to provide consistency with the other pump testing requirements. Previously, this surveillance requirement included verifying that each pump developed a differential pressure of  $\geq 112$  psi when tested on recirculation flow. The licensee has found that testing the pumps on recirculation subjected the pumps to higher vibration levels than full-flow testing, and led to unnecessary pump degradation. The licensee has determined that the full-flow testing in accordance with ASME Section XI as required in specification 4.0.5 would provide a more accurate indication of pump operability, since this is the condition at which the pump was designed to be operated. The pump testing requirements can be satisfied when the RHR system is normally in service without any special valve lineups or system configuration changes which would unnecessarily complicate the testing procedures. Therefore, this change simplifies the testing requirements and does not affect the FSAR or any regulatory basis.

The licensee's proposed change conforms with our position as stated in Section 4.4.1.4.1.1 of the Westinghouse Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-0452, Revision 4) and is thus acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

These amendments change requirements with respect to the installation or use of facility components located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20, and change surveillance requirements. 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. We have 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.

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: **SEP 23 1988**

Principal Contributor:

Fster S. Tam