

December 19, 1984

Docket No. 50-334

DISTRIBUTION

Mr. J. J. Carey, Vice President  
Nuclear Division  
Duquesne Light Company  
Post Office Box 4  
Shippingport, PA 15077

Docket File	EJordan
NRC PDR	WJones
L PDR	TBarnhart 4
Gray File 4	DBrinkman
ORB#1 Rdg	RDiggs
DEisenhut	LHarmon
OELD	SECY
CParrish	CMiles
PTam	JPartlow
ACRS 10	

Dear Mr. Carey:

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT (LICENSING ACTION TAC 52069)

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No.85 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-66 for the Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 1. The amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications in response to your application dated July 14, 1983.

The amendment changes the Technical Specifications for Beaver Valley Unit No. 1 to allow air lock leak tests be performed only upon completion of maintenance that could affect the air lock sealing capability. This amendment involves an exemption to Section III.D.2(b)(ii) of Appendix J of 10 CFR 50; the exemption was granted on November 19, 1984. Also, Amendment Nos. 75, 82 and 83 have been issued on other issues addressed by your request. This completes our actions on your submittal.

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is enclosed. The Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's next regular monthly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

Peter S. Tam, Project Manager  
Operating Reactors Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

Enclosures:

1. Amendments No.85 to DPR-66
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures:  
See next page

ORB#1:DL  
CParrish  
12/5/84

ORB#1:DL  
PTam  
12/5/84

C-ORB#1:DL  
SVarda  
12/7/84

OELD  
12/17/84

AD:OR:DL  
GLafinas  
12/9/84

8501080309 841219  
PDR ADOCK 05000334  
P PDR

Mr. J. J. Carey  
Duquesne Light Company

Beaver Valley Power Station  
Unit 1

cc: Mr. W. S. Lacey  
Station Superintendent  
Duquesne Light Company  
Beaver Valley Power Station  
Post Office Box 4  
Shippingport, PA 15007

Mr. Thomas J. Czerpah  
Mayor of the Burrough of  
Shippingport  
Post Office Box 26  
Shippingport, PA 15077

Mr. K. Grada, Superintendent  
of Licensing and Compliance  
Duquesne Light Company  
Post Office Box 4  
Shippingport, PA 15077

Pennsylvania Power Company  
Ray E. Sempler  
One E. Washington Street  
New Castle, PA 16103

Mr. John A. Levin  
Public Utility Commission  
Post Office Box 3265  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency  
Division of Planning  
Environmental Assessment Section  
Post Office Box 1049  
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Gerald Charnoff, Esquire  
Jay E. Silberg, Esquire  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge  
1800 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

Office of the Governor  
State of West Virginia  
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Karin Carter, Esquire  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
Bureau of Administrative Enforcement  
5th Floor, Executive House  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Charles A. Thomas, Esquire  
Thomas and Thomas  
212 Locust Street  
Box 999  
Harrisburg, PA 17108

Marvin Fein  
Utility Counsel  
City of Pittsburgh  
313 City-County Building  
Pittsburg, PA 15219

Regional Radiation Representative  
EPA Region III  
Curtis Building - 6th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19106

Resident Inspector  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Post Office Box 298  
Shippingport, PA 15077

Governor's Office of State Planning  
and Development  
ATTN: Coordinator, Pennsylvania  
State Clearinghouse  
Post Office Box 1323  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Department of Environmental Resources  
ATTN: Director, Office of Radiolo-  
gical Health  
Post Office Box 2063  
Harrisburg, PA 17105

Mr. Joseph H. Mills, Acting Commissioner  
State of West Virginia Department  
of Labor  
1900 Washington Street  
East Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Beaver Valley Power Station  
Unit 1

- 2 -

cc: N. H. Dyer, M.D.  
State Director of Health  
State Department of Health  
1800 Washington Street, East  
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Irwin A. Popowsky, Esquire  
Office of Consumer Advocate  
1425 Strawberry Square  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Regional Administrator, Region I  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
631 Park Avenue  
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Mr. Thomas M. Gerusky, Director  
Bureau of Radiation Protection  
Pennsylvania Department of  
Environmental Resources  
P.O. Box 2063  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120



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

DUQUESNE LIGHT COMPANY

OHIO EDISON COMPANY

PENNSYLVANIA POWER COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-334

BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No.85  
License No. DPR-66

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
  - A. The application for amendment by Duquesne Light Company, Ohio Edison Company, and Pennsylvania Power Company (the licensees) dated July 14, 1983, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
  - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
  - C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;
  - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
  - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.
2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. DPR-66 is hereby amended to read as follows:

8501080315 841219  
PDR ADDCK 05000334  
P PDR

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 85, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This amendment is effective on issuance, to be implemented no later than 30 days after issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

  
Steven A. Varga, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #1  
Division of Licensing

Attachment:  
Changes to the Technical  
Specifications

Date of Issuance:  
December 19, 1984

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 85 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-66

DOCKET NO. 50-334

Revise Appendix A as follows:

Remove Page

3/4 6-5a

Insert Page

3/4 6-5a

CONTAINMENT SYSTEMS

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

---

- 4.6.1.3 Each containment air lock shall be demonstrated OPERABLE:
- a. Within 72 hours following each containment entry, except when the air lock is being used for multiple entries, then at least once per 72 hours, by verifying no detectable seal leakage when the gap between the door seals is pressurized for at least 2 minutes to:
    - 1. Personnel airlock  $\geq 38.3$  psig
    - 2. Emergency air lock  $\geq 10.0$  psigor, by quantifying the total air lock leakage to insure the requirements of 3.6.1.3.b are met.
  - b. By conducting overall air lock leakage tests, at not less than  $P_a$  (38.3 psig), and verifying the overall air lock leakage rate is within its limit:
    - 1. At least once per 6 months, # and
    - 2. Upon completion of maintenance which has been performed on the air lock that could affect the air lock sealing capability.\*
  - c. At least once per 18 months during shutdown by verifying:
    - 1. Only one door in each air lock can be opened at a time, and
    - 2. No detectable seal leakage when the volume between the emergency air lock shaft seals is pressurized to greater than or equal to 38.3 psig for at least 2 minutes.

---

# The provisions of Specification 4.0.2 are not applicable.

\* Exemption to Appendix J of 10 CFR 50, dated November 19, 1984.



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO.85 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-66

DUQUESNE LIGHT COMPANY

OHIO EDISON COMPANY

PENNSYLVANIA POWER COMPANY

BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-334

Introduction

By letter dated July 14, 1983, Duquesne Light Company (the licensee) applied for an amendment to Operating License DPR-66 to make a number of changes in the Technical Specifications. All changes, except one, have been addressed by previous amendments, Amendment Nos. 75, 82 and 83. The remaining item is the subject of this safety evaluation.

Discussion and Evaluation

Section III.D.2(b)(ii) of Appendix J, 10 CFR 50, states that "Air locks opened during periods when containment integrity is not required by the plant Technical Specifications shall be tested at the end of such periods at not less than Pa".

Duquesne Light Company has requested that the Beaver Valley Unit No. 1 Technical Specification 4.6.1.3 be changed to require an overall air lock leak rate test at Pa (38.3 psig) to be performed only "Upon completion of maintenance which has been performed on the air lock that could affect the air lock sealing capability". This requested technical specification change would constitute a deviation from the subject regulation.

Containment integrity is not required whenever the plant is in cold shutdown (Mode 5) or refueling (Mode 6). If an airlock is opened during Modes 5 and 6, Appendix J nevertheless requires that an overall air lock leakage test at not less than Pa be conducted prior to plant startup (i.e., entering Mode 4).

Airlocks typically do not have the capability to be pressurized internally to Pa and remain leaktight, without the installation of holding devices (strongbacks) or mechanical adjustment of the operating mechanisms of the inner doors. This is because the inner doors are designed to be seated with the application of pressure on the containment side of the door. During air lock testing, the test pressure exerted on the air lock side of the inner door causes the door to unseat. The use of strongbacks or mechanical adjustment of the door prevents the unseating of the inner door, allowing the

test to proceed. The installation of strongback or performance of mechanical adjustments, however, is time-consuming (often taking several hours), may result in additional radiation exposure of operating personnel, and may cause degradation of the operating mechanism of the inner door with consequent loss of reliability of the air lock. In addition, when conditions require frequent openings over a short period of time, testing at Pa after each opening becomes impractical (tests often take from 8 hours to several days), accelerates degradation of mechanical equipment, and increases personnel exposure to radiation.

Paragraph III.D.2(b)(i) requires that air locks be tested at Pa at 6-month intervals. Paragraph III.D.2(b)(iii) provides that air locks opened during periods when containment integrity is required, their seals must be tested within 3 days after opening. If both types of tests are current and no maintenance has been performed on the air lock, there should be no reason to expect the air lock to leak excessively just because it has been opened in Mode 5 or 6. Consequently, when no maintenance has been performed on an air lock, the tests prescribed by Paragraph III.d.2(b)(i) and III.D.2(b)(iii) should be sufficient; whenever maintenance has been performed on an airlock, the requirements of Paragraph III.D.2.(ii) of Appendix J must still be met.

The Commission has, on November 19, 1984, granted an exemption with respect to the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, Section III.D.2(b)(ii) to allow the Beaver Valley Unit 1 Technical Specifications be amended to require "overall air lock leak test at Pa prior to establishing containment integrity and upon completion of air lock maintenance that could affect the air lock sealing capability." The issuance of an amendment would bring the Technical Specifications into conformance with the exemption.

In summary, the licensee's proposed change to Section 4.6.1.3.b of the Technical Specifications is administrative in nature and do not involve physical changes to the air locks. There is adequate assurance that containment boundary integrity will be preserved during plant operation, and that the leakage integrity of the air locks will be maintained. Therefore, we conclude that the proposed change to the Technical Specifications is acceptable, as stated above.

#### Environmental Consideration

This amendment involves a change in the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The staff has determined that the amendment involves 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 this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR Sec 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 this amendment.

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 this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: December 19, 1985

Principal Contributor:

J. Guo