

pressure. Additional testing would be required when reactor coolant pressure is greater than or equal to 950 psig and prior to 40 percent rated thermal power.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration which is presented below:

1. Does the change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

The proposed change provides more stringent requirements for operation of the facility. These more stringent requirements do not result in operation that will increase the probability of initiating an analyzed event and do not alter assumptions relative to mitigation of an accident or transient event. The more restrictive requirements continue to ensure process variables, structures, systems and components are maintained consistent with the safety analysis and licensing basis. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or changes in the methods governing normal plant operation. The proposed change does impose different requirements. However, these changes are consistent with assumptions made in the safety analysis and licensing basis. Thus, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does this change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

The imposition of more restrictive requirements either has no impact on or increase in the margin of plant safety. As provided in the discussion of the change, each change in this category is by definition providing additional restrictions to enhance plant safety. The change maintains requirements within safety analyses and licensing bases. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Perry Public Library, 3753 Main Street, Perry, Ohio 44081

Attorney for licensee: Jay Silberg, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037

NRC Project Director: Gail H. Marcus

Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company, and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Docket No. 50-346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio

Date of amendment request: April 10, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the following Technical Specifications (TS) and their associated Bases: TS 3/4.7.1.2, "Auxiliary Feedwater System," to clarify Action "a" by inserting "or both" steam generator(s) and to remove references to pressure indicators and specific pressure readings and adding performance based requirements; TS 3/4.7.1.3, "Condensate Storage Tanks," to modify the Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) to more closely conform to standard TS; and TS 3/4.7.1.7, "Motor Driven Feedwater Pump System," to consolidate the requirements of 2 current surveillance requirements and clarify the operability requirements when local manual valves are realigned for testing purposes.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

Toledo Edison has reviewed the proposed changes and determined that a significant hazards consideration does not exist because operation of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit Number 1, in accordance with these changes would:

a. Not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated because no change is being made to any accident initiator. No previous analyzed accident scenario is changed, and initiating conditions and assumptions remain as previously analyzed. The proposed changes are clarifications and the incorporations of the guidance provided by NUREG-1430. Therefore, it can be concluded that the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

b. Not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the proposed changes do not affect accident conditions or assumptions used in evaluating the radiological consequences of an accident. The proposed changes do not alter the source term, containment isolation or allowable radiological releases.

2. Not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the proposed changes do not change the way the plant is operated and, no new or different failure modes have been defined for any plant system or component important to safety, nor has any limiting single failure been identified as a result of the proposed changes. No new

or different types of failures or accident initiators are introduced by the proposed changes.

3. Not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the proposed changes are clarifications and the incorporations of the guidance provided by NUREG-1430, and continue to ensure the availability and capability of the Auxiliary Feedwater System, Service Water System and the Motor Driven Feedwater Pump System when called upon to perform their functions. The proposed changes will not adversely impact any safety analysis assumptions.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

Attorney for licensee: Jay E. Silberg, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Project Director: Gail H. Marcus

Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company, and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Docket No. 50-346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio

Date of amendment request: June 1, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the allowed outage time from 72 hours to 7 days for one unavailable emergency diesel generator (EDG) as detailed in Technical Specification 3.8.1.1, "AC Power Sources, Operating," and its associated Bases 3.0.5.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

Toledo Edison has reviewed the proposed change and determined that a significant hazards consideration does not exist because operation of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station (DBNPS), Unit No. 1, in accordance with this change would:

1a. Not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated because the proposed change to increase the allowed outage time for one emergency diesel generator from three (3) days to seven (7) days does not make a change to any accident initiator, initiating condition or assumption. The accident previously evaluated in the DBNPS Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR) Section 15.2.9, Loss of All AC Power to the Station