

APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT  
TO  
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-3  
FOR  
DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION  
UNIT NO. 1

Enclosed are forty-three (43) copies of the requested changes to the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station Unit No. 1 Facility Operating License No. NPF-3, together with the Safety Evaluation for the requested change.

The proposed changes include Table 3.3-10 and 4.3-10.

By *W. L. Horn*  
Vice President, Nuclear

Sworn and subscribed before me this 28<sup>th</sup> day of February, 1984.

*Laurie A. Stickle, sec*  
Notary Public (*Brudzinski*)

Docket No. 50-346  
License No. NPF-3  
Serial No. 1028  
February 28, 1984

Attachment

- I. Changes to Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station Unit 1, Appendix A Technical Specification Tables 3.3-10 and 4.3-10.
  - A. Time required to Implement. This change is to be effective upon NRC approval.
  - B. Reason for Change (Facility Change Request 84-031).

The Containment Recirculating System (CRS) was deleted from the Technical Specification with issuance of Amendment 66 dated January 20, 1984 (Log No. 1437). The Post Accident Monitoring containing the CRS was overlooked and this request is to correct the oversight.
  - C. Safety Evaluation  
(See attachment)
  - D. Significant Hazard Consideration  
(See attached)

### SAFETY EVALUATION

This amendment request for the deletion of containment recirculating system (CRS) from the Post Accident requirements in Technical Specifications Tables 3.3-10 and 4.3-10.

The Technical Specifications requirement of Section 3.6.4.2 and Basis for the Containment Recirculation System was deleted by Amendment 66 dated January 20, 1984 (Log No. 1437). The original design safety function associated with the system was deleted with issuance of the amendment.

The changes made in the previous amendment request for the CRS overlooked the Post-Accident Monitoring in Tables 3.3-10 and 4.3-10. The safety evaluation deleting the CRS provided detailed justification for the removal of the CRS from our Technical Specification. All references of this system should have been deleted at the time of the original request (January 13, 1984).

This request to delete the Post Accident Monitoring for the CRS is to provide consistency within the Technical Specifications. Therefore, this is not an unreviewed safety question.

sc c/2

### SIGNIFICANT HAZARD CONSIDERATION

This amendment request to delete the requirement for the Containment Recirculation System (CRS) from the Post-Accident Monitoring Instrumentation (Table 3.3-10 and 4.3-10) does not contain a Significant Hazard. Toledo Edison received an Amendment #66 dated January 20, 1984, Log No. 1437 deleting the requirement from the Technical Specifications for the Containment Recirculation System.

Toledo Edison submitted an amendment request on January 13, 1984, as supplemented by letter dated January 17, 1984, to delete the requirement for the CRS. The amendment request was granted on January 20, 1984. In the preparation of this request and granting of same, the post-accident monitoring requirement was overlooked. To ensure completeness and accuracy of the Technical Specification we are requesting the deletion of the post-accident monitoring section for the CRS.

The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the criteria in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (40 FR 14870). One of the examples of the actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to a purely administrative change to technical specifications; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature (example (i)).

In addition we have reviewed the proposed change against each of the criteria in 10 CFR 50.92, namely that the proposed change 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 amendment request is to achieve consistency within the Technical Specification for the amendment request previously granted and is only an administrative change.

Therefore, based on the above and the attached safety evaluation, the proposed amendment does not contain a significant hazard.

sc c/2