

ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS

TABLE 4.8.2.3.2-1

BATTERY SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

Parameter	CATEGORY A ⁽¹⁾	CATEGORY B ⁽²⁾	
	Limits for each designated pilot cell	Limits for each connected cell	Allowable ⁽³⁾ value for each connected cell
Electrolyte Level	>Minimum level indication mark and $\leq \frac{1}{4}$ " above maximum level indication mark	>Minimum level indication mark, and $\leq \frac{1}{4}$ " above maximum level indication mark	Above top of plates, and not overflowing
Float Voltage	≥ 2.13 volts	≥ 2.13 volts ^(c)	> 2.07 volts
Specific Gravity ^(a)	$\geq 1.200^{(b)}$ $\geq 1.195^{*(b)}$	≥ 1.195 , $\geq 1.190^{*}$	Not more than .020 below the average of all connected cells
		Average of all connected cells > 1.205 $> 1.200^{*}$	Average of all connected cells $\geq 1.195^{(b)}$ $\geq 1.190^{*}$

(a) Corrected for electrolyte temperature and level.

(b) Or battery charging current is less than 2 amperes when on float charge.

(c) May be corrected for average electrolyte temperature.

- (1) For any Category A parameter(s) outside the limit(s) shown, the battery may be considered OPERABLE provided that within 24 hours all the Category B measurements are taken and found to be within their allowable values, and provided all Category A and B parameter(s) are restored to within limits within the next 7 days.
- (2) For any Category B parameter(s) outside the limit(s) shown, the battery may be considered OPERABLE provided that the Category B parameters are within their allowable values and provided the Category B parameter(s) are restored to within limits within 7 days.
- (3) Any Category B parameter not within its allowable value indicates an inoperable battery.

*For division 3 batteries only.

TABLE 4.8.2.3.2-1

BATTERY SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

Parameter	CATEGORY A ⁽¹⁾	CATEGORY B ⁽²⁾	
	Limits for each designated pilot cell	Limits for each connected cell	Allowable ⁽³⁾ value for each connected cell
Electrolyte Level	>Minimum level indication mark and $\leq \frac{1}{4}$ " above maximum level indication mark	>Minimum level indication mark, and $\leq \frac{1}{4}$ " above maximum level indication mark	Above top of plates, and not overflowing
Float Voltage	≥ 2.13 volts	≥ 2.13 volts ^(c)	> 2.07 volts
Specific Gravity ^(a)	$\geq 1.200^{(b)}$ $\geq 1.195^{*(b)}$	≥ 1.195 , $\geq 1.190^*$	Not more than .020 below the average of all connected cells
		Average of all connected cells > 1.205 $> 1.200^*$	Average of all connected cells $> 1.195^{(b)}$ $\geq 1.190^*$

(a) Corrected for electrolyte temperature and level.

(b) Or battery charging current is less than 2 amperes when on float charge.

(c) May be corrected for average electrolyte temperature.

(1) For any Category A parameter(s) outside the limit(s) shown, the battery may be considered OPERABLE provided that within 24 hours all the Category B measurements are taken and found to be within their allowable values, and provided all Category A and B parameter(s) are restored to within limits within the next 7 days.

(2) For any Category B parameter(s) outside the limit(s) shown, the battery may be considered OPERABLE provided that the Category B parameters are within their allowable values and provided the Category B parameter(s) are restored to within limits within 7 days.

(3) Any Category B parameter not within its allowable value indicates an inoperable battery.

*For division 3 batteries only.

ATTACHMENT C

EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION

Commonwealth Edison has evaluated this proposed amendment and determined that it involves no significant hazards considerations. According to 10 CFR 50.92 (c), a proposed amendment to an operating license involves no significant hazards considerations if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or
2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or
3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because:

These amendments are required as a result of the upcoming replacement of the Unit 1 and Unit 2 engineered safety feature (ESF) Division III 125 Volt DC batteries. The DC distribution system and the batteries are designed to provide control power for both normal and emergency operation of plant equipment and to provide power for automatic operation of the protection systems during abnormal and accident conditions (UFSAR Section 8.3.2.1). The Technical Specification limits for battery specific gravity are based on the manufacturer's nominal full charge specific gravity rating for a particular battery type. The replacement batteries are of a different type and are rated with a higher nominal full charge specific gravity value than are the currently installed batteries. Increasing the Technical Specification specific gravity limits for the Division III batteries will ensure that they are maintained in an operable condition capable of meeting their design function. Batteries are not considered as initiators of accidents; therefore, there is no increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated. New specific gravity limits will assure that the batteries function as assumed in the safety analysis; therefore, there is no increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because:

The proposed amendment reflects the change in nominal full charge specific gravity rating between the currently installed battery and the replacement batteries. The proposed amendment does not bring about any changes to the facility or to the operation of the facility as described in the UFSAR. The new batteries function the same as previous design without introducing a new failure mechanism or increasing the probability of failure. The modification of the ESF Division III DC battery specific gravity requirements does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident than previously evaluated.

ATTACHMENT C (continued)

The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because:

The bases for Technical Specification 3/4.8.2 provides the criteria for establishing the battery specific gravity limits based on the manufacturer's ratings. The limits currently provided in the Technical Specifications for the Division III batteries are non-conservative for the replacement batteries. Therefore, the Technical Specification gravity limits for the Division III batteries must be increased in order to maintain the current margin of safety.

Guidance has been provided in 51 FR 7744 for the application of standards to license change requests for determination of the existence of significant hazards considerations. This document provides examples of amendments which are not likely considered to involve significant hazards considerations. These proposed amendments most closely fit the example of an administrative change performed to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications. This proposed amendment does not involve a significant relaxation of the criteria used to establish safety limits, a significant relaxation of the bases for the limiting safety system settings or a significant relaxation of the bases for the limiting conditions for operations. Therefore, based on the guidance provided in the Federal Register and the criteria established in 10 CFR 50.92 (c), the proposed change does not constitute a significant hazards consideration.

ATTACHMENT D

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STATEMENT APPLICABILITY REVIEW

Commonwealth Edison has evaluated the proposed amendment against the criteria for the identification of licensing and regulatory actions requiring environmental assessment in accordance with 10 CFR 51.20. It has been determined that the proposed changes meet the criteria for a categorical exclusion as provided under 10 CFR 51.22 (c)(9). This conclusion has been determined because the changes requested do not pose significant hazards consideration or do not involve a significant increase in the amounts, and no significant changes in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite. Additionally, this request does not involve a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.