

50-220



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

February 10, 1997

Mr. B. Ralph Sylvia
Executive Vice President Generation
Business Group and Chief Nuclear Officer
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation
Nuclear Learning Center
450 Lake Road
Oswego, NY 13126

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT FOR NINE MILE POINT NUCLEAR STATION UNIT
NO. 1 (TAC NOS. M96081 AND M89522)

Dear Mr. Sylvia:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 159 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-63 for the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit No. 1 (NMP1). The amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) in response to your application transmitted by letter dated July 16, 1996.

This amendment revises the Technical Specifications (TSs) to reflect the implementation of 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix J, Option B at NMP1. The amendment changes the TSs to implement 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Option B, by referring to Regulatory Guide 1.1.63, "Performance-Based Containment Leakage-Rate Testing Program." Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.163, was developed as a method acceptable to the NRC staff for implementing Option B. The staff has reviewed the changes to the TS and associated Bases proposed by the licensee and finds that they are in compliance with the requirements of Appendix J, Option B, and are consistent with the guidance of RG 1.163, dated September 1995, with two exceptions and conform with the model TS except as discussed in the Safety Evaluation, and are therefore acceptable.

Concerning your earlier request for exemption from Appendix J, dated May 20, 1994, regarding a water seal on the containment isolation valves in the containment spray system, the adoption of Option B of Appendix J has eliminated the need for an exemption in that Option B does not contain the explicit requirements in Option A from which the exemption was requested. The containment isolation valves in the containment spray system do not require Type C testing under the provision of Option B and the associated guidance documents. We consider all work under TAC Nos. M96081 and M89522 as being complete.

130002

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

Dro1
1/1

9702130027 970210
PDR ADOCK 05000220
P PDR

Mr. B. Sylvia

- 2 -

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's biweekly Federal Register Notice.

Sincerely,

Alan Wang For

Darl S. Hood, Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate I-1
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-220

Enclosures: 1. Amendment No. 159 to
DPR-63
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

B. Ralph Sylvia
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation

Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station
Unit No. 1

cc:

Mr. Richard B. Abbott
Vice President and General Manager -
Nuclear
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation
Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station
P.O. Box 63
Lycoming, NY 13093

Charles Donaldson, Esquire
Assistant Attorney General
New York Department of Law
120 Broadway
New York, NY 10271

Mr. Martin J. McCormick, Jr.
Vice President
Nuclear Safety Assessment
and Support
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation
Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station
P.O. Box 63
Lycoming, NY 13093

Mr. Paul D. Eddy
State of New York
Department of Public Service
Power Division, System Operations
3 Empire State Plaza
Albany, NY 12223

Ms. Denise J. Wolniak
Manager Licensing
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation
Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station
P.O. Box 63
Lycoming, NY 13093

Mr. F. William Valentino, President
New York State Energy, Research,
and Development Authority
Corporate Plaza West
286 Washington Avenue Extension
Albany, NY 12203-6399

Mr. Kim A. Dahlberg
General Manager - Projects
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation
Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station
P.O. Box 63
Lycoming, NY 13093

Mark J. Wetterhahn, Esquire
Winston & Strawn
1400 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005-3502

Mr. Norman L. Rademacher
Plant Manager, Unit 1
Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station
P.O. Box 63
Lycoming, NY 13093

Gary D. Wilson, Esquire
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation
300 Erie Boulevard West
Syracuse, NY 13202

Regional Administrator, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Supervisor
Town of Scriba
Route 8, Box 382
Oswego, NY 13126

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P.O. Box 126
Lycoming, NY 13093

February 10, 1997

Mr. B. Sylvia

- 2 -

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's biweekly Federal Register Notice.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY A. WANG FOR:

Darl S. Hood, Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate I-1
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-220

- Enclosures: 1. Amendment No.159 to DPR-63
- 2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encs: See next page

DISTRIBUTION: See attached sheet

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\NMP1\M96081.AMD

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without enclosures "E" = Copy with enclosures "N" = No copy

*Review of
to make
comments.*

OFFICE	PM:PDI-1	LA:PDI-1	D:PDI-1	OGC	SCSB
NAME	DHood/rs1	SLittle	SBajwa	C. Muro	CBerlinger
DATE	02/5/97	02/5/97	02/10/97	02/06/97	02/5/97

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DATED: February 10, 1997

AMENDMENT NO. 159 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-63-NINE MILE POINT
NUCLEAR POWER STATION UNIT NO. 1

Docket File

PUBLIC

PDI-1 Reading

S. Varga

S. Bajwa

S. Little

D. Hood

A. Wang

J. Pulsipher

OGC

G. Hill (2), T-5 C3

C. Grimes

C. Berlinger

ACRS

C. Cowgill, Region I

cc: Plant Service list



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION

DOCKET NO. 50-220

NINE MILE POINT NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 159
License No. DPR-63

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment by Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (the licensee) dated July 16, 1996, 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 1;
 - 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. NPF-69 is hereby amended to read as follows:

9702130033 970210
PDR ADOCK 05000220
P PDR

(2) Technical Specifications and Environmental Protection Plan

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A and the Environmental Protection Plan contained in Appendix B, both of which are attached hereto, as revised through Amendment No. 159 are hereby incorporated into this license. Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications and the Environmental Protection Plan.

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance to be implemented within 30 days.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



S. Singh Bajwa, Acting Director
Project Directorate I-1
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: February 10, 1997

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 159 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-63

DOCKET NO. 50-220

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with the attached pages. The revised pages are identified by Amendment number and contain vertical lines indicating the area of change.

Remove

Insert

vi
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
141
142
373
374

vi
131
132
133

141
142
373
374

SECTION	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
6.10	Record Retention	370
6.11	Radiation Protection Program	371
6.12	High Radiation Area	371
6.13	Fire Protection Inspection	373
6.14	Systems Integrity	373
6.15	Iodine Monitoring	373
6.16	10 CFR 50 Appendix J Testing Program Plan	373

LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION

3.3.3 LEAKAGE RATE

Applicability:

Applies to the allowable leakage rate of the primary containment system.

Objective:

To assure the capability of the containment in limiting radiation exposure to the public from exceeding values specified in 10 CFR 100 in the event of a loss-of-coolant accident accompanied by significant fuel cladding failure and hydrogen generation from a metal-water reaction.

To assure that periodic surveillances of reactor containment penetrations and isolation valves are performed so that proper maintenance and repairs are made during the service life of the containment, and systems and components penetrating primary containment.

Specification:

Whenever the reactor coolant system temperature is above 215°F the primary containment leakage rate shall be limited to:

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENT

4.3.3 LEAKAGE RATE

Applicability:

Applies to the primary containment system leakage rate.

Objective:

To verify that the leakage from the primary containment system is maintained within specified values.

Specification:

- a. The primary containment leakage rates shall be demonstrated at test schedules and in conformance with the criteria specified in the 10 CFR 50 Appendix J Testing Program Plan as described in Specification 6.16.
- b. The provisions of Specification 4.0.1 are not applicable, and the surveillance interval extensions are in accordance with the 10 CFR 50 Appendix J Testing Program Plan.

LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENT

- a. An overall integrated leakage rate of less than 1.5% by weight of the containment air per day (La), at 35 psig (Pac).
- b. A combined leakage rate on a minimum pathway basis of less than 0.6 La for all penetrations and all Primary Containment Isolation Valves subject to Types B and C tests when pressurized to 35 psig (Pac).

PAGES 133 THROUGH 139 DELETED

BASES FOR 3.3.3 AND 4.3.3 LEAKAGE RATE

Although the dose calculations suggest that the allowable test leak rate could be allowed to increase to about 3.0%/day before the guideline thyroid dose limit given in 10CFR100 would be exceeded, establishing the limit at 1.5%/day provides an adequate margin of safety to assure the health and safety of the general public. It is further considered that the allowable leak rate should not deviate significantly from the containment design value to take advantage of the design leak-tightness capability of the structure over its service lifetime. Additional margin to maintain the containment in the "as built" condition is achieved by establishing the allowable operational leak rate. The operational limit is derived by multiplying the allowable test leak rate by 0.75 thereby providing a 25% margin to allow for leakage deterioration which may occur during the period between leak rate tests.

Closure of the containment isolation valves for the purpose of the test is accomplished by the means provided for normal operation of the valves. The reactor is vented to the containment atmosphere during ILRT testing.

The primary containment leak rate test frequency is based on maintaining adequate assurance that the leak rate remains within the specification. The leak rate test frequency is based on Option B of 10 CFR 50 Appendix J.

The penetration and air purge piping leakage test frequency, along with the containment leak rate tests, is adequate to allow detection of leakage trends. Whenever a double-gasketed penetration (primary containment head equipment hatches and the suppression chamber access hatch) is broken and remade, the space between the gaskets is pressurized to determine that the seals are performing properly. The test pressure of 35 psig is consistent with the accident analyses and the maximum preoperational leak rate test pressure. It is expected that the majority of the leakage from valves, penetrations and seals would be into the reactor building. However, it is possible that leakage into other parts of the facility could occur. Such leakage paths that may affect significantly the consequences of accidents are to be minimized.

Leakage from airlocks is measured under accident pressures in accordance with Option B of 10 CFR 50 Appendix J.

BASES FOR 3.3.3 AND 4.3.3 LEAKAGE RATE

The Type A test follows the guidelines stated in ANSI/ANS-56.8⁽⁸⁾ and/or the Bechtel Topical Report.⁽⁴⁾ This program provides adequate assurance that the test results realistically estimates the degree of containment leakage following a loss-of-coolant accident. The containment leakage rate is calculated using the Absolute Methodology.⁽⁸⁾

The specific treatment of selective valve arrangements including the acceptability of the interpretations of 10 CFR 50 Appendix J requirements are given in References 5, 6, and 7. They serve as the bases for alternative test configurations (e.g., reverse accident, multi-valve, water leakage flow tests) as well as relaxations from previous leakage limits or constraints.

References:

- (1) FSAR, Volume II, Appendix E
- (2) UFSAR, Section VI B.2.1
- (3) TID-20583, Leakage Characteristics of Steel Containment Vessels and the Analysis of Leakage Determinations
- (4) BN-TOP-1 "Testing Criteria for Integrated Leakage Rate Testing of Primary Containment Structures for Nuclear Power Plants," Revision 1, Bechtel Corporation, November 1, 1972
- (5) NRC Safety Evaluation Report dated May 6, 1988, "Regarding Proposed Technical Specifications and Exemption Requests Related to Appendix J."
- (6) Niagara Mohawk Letter dated July 28, 1988, "Clarifications, Justifications & Conformance with 10 CFR 50 Appendix J SER."
- (7) NRC Letter dated November 9, 1988, "Review of the July 28, 1988 Letter on Appendix J Containment Leakage Rate Testing at Nine Mile Point Unit 1."
- (8) ANSI/ANS - 56.8 - 1994, "Containment System Leakage Testing Requirements."

6.13 Fire Protection Inspection

6.13.1 An independent fire protection and loss prevention inspection and audit shall be performed annually utilizing either qualified off-site licensee personnel or an outside fire protection firm.

6.13.2 An inspection and audit by an outside qualified fire consultant shall be performed at intervals no greater than 3 years.

6.14 Systems Integrity

Procedure shall be established, implemented and maintained to meet or exceed the requirements and recommendations of Section 2.1.6.a of NUREG 0578.

6.15 Iodine Monitoring

Procedures shall be established, implemented and maintained to meet or exceed the requirements and recommendations of Section 2.1.8.c of NUREG 0578.

6.16 10 CFR 50 Appendix J Testing Program Plan

A program shall be established to implement the leakage rate testing of the containment as required by 10 CFR 50.54(o) and 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, Option B. This program shall be in accordance with the guidelines contained in Regulatory Guide 1.163, entitled "Performance-Based Containment Leak-Test Program," dated September 1995 with the following exceptions:

1. Type A tests will be conducted in accordance with ANSI/ANS 56.8-1994 and/or Bechtel Topic BN-TOP-1, and
2. The first Type A test following approval of this Specification will be a full pressure test conducted approximately 70, rather than 48, months since the last low pressure Type A test.

The peak calculated containment internal pressure (Pac) for the design basis loss of coolant accident is 35 psig.

The maximum allowable primary containment leakage rate (La) at Pac shall be 1.5% of primary containment air weight per day.

Leakage Rate Surveillance Test acceptance criteria are:

1. The as-found Primary Containment Integrated Leak Rate Test (Type A Test) acceptance criteria is less than 1.0 L_p.
2. The as-left Primary Containment Integrated Leak Rate Test (Type A Test) acceptance criteria is less than or equal to 0.75 L_p, prior to entering a mode of operation where containment integrity is required.
3. The combined Local Leak Rate Test (Type B & C Tests including airlocks) acceptance criteria is less than 0.6 L_p, calculated on a maximum pathway basis, prior to entering a mode of operation where containment integrity is required.

4. The combined Local Leak Rate Test (Type B & C Tests including airlocks) acceptance criteria is less than $0.6 L_v$, calculated on a minimum pathway basis, at all times when containment integrity is required.

The provisions of Specification 4.0.1 do not apply to the test frequencies specified in the 10 CFR 50 Appendix J Testing Program Plan.



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 159 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-63
NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION
NINE MILE POINT, UNIT NO. 1
DOCKET NO. 50-220

1.0 INTRODUCTION

On September 12, 1995, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approved issuance of a revision to 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, "Primary Reactor Containment Leakage Testing for Water-Cooled Power Reactors" which was subsequently published in the Federal Register on September 26, 1995, and became effective on October 26, 1995. The NRC added Option B, "Performance-Based Requirements," to allow licensees to voluntarily replace the prescriptive testing requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, with testing requirements based on both overall performance and the performance of individual components.

By letter dated July 16, 1996, Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (the licensee) requested changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) for Nine Mile Point, Unit 1. The proposed changes would permit implementation of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Option B. The licensee has established a "10 CFR 50 Appendix J Testing Program Plan" and proposed adding this program plan to the TS. The program plan references Regulatory Guide 1.163, "Performance-Based Containment Leak Test Program," dated September 1995, which specifies a method acceptable to the NRC for complying with Option B.

2.0 BACKGROUND

Compliance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, provides assurance that the primary containment, including those systems and components which penetrate the primary containment, do not exceed the allowable leakage rate specified in the TS and Bases. The allowable leakage rate is determined so that the leakage rate assumed in the safety analyses is not exceeded.

On February 4, 1992, the NRC published a notice in the Federal Register (57 FR 4166) discussing a planned initiative to begin eliminating requirements marginal to safety which impose a significant regulatory burden. 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, "Primary Containment Leakage Testing for Water-Cooled Power Reactors," was considered for this initiative and the staff undertook a study of possible changes to this regulation. The study examined the previous performance history of domestic containments and examined the effect on risk of a revision to the requirements of Appendix J. The results of this study are reported in NUREG-1493, "Performance-Based Leak-Test Program."

9702130040 970210
PDR ADOCK 05000220
P PDR

Based on the results of this study, the staff developed a performance-based approach to containment leakage rate testing. On September 12, 1995, the NRC approved issuance of this revision to 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, which was subsequently published in the Federal Register on September 26, 1995, and became effective on October 26, 1995. The revision added Option B, "Performance-Based Requirements," to Appendix J to allow licensees to voluntarily replace the prescriptive testing requirements of Appendix J with testing requirements based on both overall and individual component leakage rate performance.

Regulatory Guide 1.163, "Performance-Based Containment Leak Test Program," dated September 1995, was developed as a method acceptable to the NRC staff for implementing Option B. This regulatory guide states that the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) guidance document NEI 94-01, Rev. 0, "Industry Guideline for Implementing Performance-Based Option of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J," provides methods acceptable to the NRC staff for complying with Option B with four exceptions which are described therein.

Option B requires that Regulatory Guide 1.163 or another implementation document used by a licensee to develop a performance-based leakage testing program must be included, by general reference, in the plant TS. The licensee has referenced Regulatory Guide 1.163 in the proposed Nine Mile Point, Unit 1 TS.

Regulatory Guide 1.163 specifies an extension in Type A test frequency to at least one test in 10 years based upon two consecutive successful tests. Type B tests may be extended up to a maximum interval of 10 years based upon completion of two consecutive successful tests and Type C tests may be extended up to 5 years based on two consecutive successful tests.

By letter dated October 20, 1995, NEI proposed TS to implement Option B. After some discussion, the staff and NEI agreed on final TS which were transmitted to NEI in a letter dated November 2, 1995. These TS are to serve as a model for licensees to develop plant-specific TS in preparing amendment requests to implement Option B.

In order for a licensee to determine the performance of each component, factors that are indicative of or affect performance, such as an administrative leakage limit, must be established. The administrative limit is selected to be indicative of the potential onset of component degradation. Although these limits are subject to NRC inspection to assure that they are selected in a reasonable manner, they are not TS requirements. Failure to meet an administrative limit requires the licensee to return to the minimum value of the test interval.

Option B requires that the licensee maintain records to show that the criteria for Type A, B, and C tests have been met. In addition, the licensee must maintain comparisons of the performance of the overall containment system and the individual components to show that the test intervals are adequate. These records are subject to NRC inspection.

3.0 EVALUATION

The licensee's July 16, 1996, letter to the NRC proposes to establish a "10 CFR 50 Appendix J Testing Program Plan" and proposes to add this program plan to the TS. The program plan references Regulatory Guide 1.163, "Performance-Based Containment Leak Test Program," dated September 1995, which specifies methods acceptable to the NRC for complying with Option B. This requires changes to existing TS 3.3.3 and 4.3.3, and the addition of the "10 CFR 50 Appendix J Testing Program Plan" as Section 6.16. Corresponding bases were also modified.

Option B permits a licensee to choose Type A; or Type B and C; or Type A, B and C; testing to be done on a performance basis. The licensee has elected to perform Type A, B, and C testing on a performance basis.

The TS changes proposed by the licensee are in compliance with the requirements of Option B and consistent with the guidance of Regulatory Guide 1.163, with two exceptions noted by the licensee; these are discussed in sections 3.1 and 3.2, below. Further, despite the different format of the licensee's current TS, all of the important elements of the model TS guidance provided in the NRC letter to NEI dated November 2, 1995, are included in the proposed TS, with a few exceptions as discussed in section 3.3, below.

3.1 Extension Of Current Type A Test Interval

The licensee's proposed TS changes include a one-time exception to Regulatory Guide 1.163 in that the next Type A test will be performed at an interval of approximately 70 months, rather than 48 months, since the last Type A test. Regulatory Guide 1.163 endorses NEI 94-01 which states that periodic Type A tests shall be performed at intervals of 48 months until acceptable performance is established to extend the test intervals. Acceptable performance history is defined as completion of two consecutive periodic Type A tests where the calculated performance leakage rate was less than $1.0 L_a$. At least one of these tests must be performed at peak accident pressure (P_a). Since the periodic Type A tests at Nine Mile Point, Unit 1, have been conducted at reduced pressure, the licensee must perform a full pressure test in order to implement the extended Type A test interval provisions of Option B. Absent the proposed exception to Regulatory Guide 1.163, the next Type A test for Nine Mile Point, Unit 1, would have to be performed during the spring 1997 refueling outage (Refueling Outage 14). The licensee's proposal would delay the next Type A test until Refueling Outage 15, early in 1999. That test will be conducted at full pressure, P_a , and if it is successful, the next test may be done at the extended interval of 10 years.

Industry experience indicates that the largest contribution to containment leakage comes from the containment penetrations and not from the containment walls or liner plate. Penetration and valve leakage rates are measured by Type B and C tests, and the schedule for these tests will be consistent with NEI 94-01. Further, results from the two most recent Type A tests show that the calculated performance leakage rates were less than the performance leakage rate acceptance criterion for a reduced pressure test, $1.0 L_t$, where L_t is the maximum allowable leakage rate at reduced pressure.

In addition, the licensee notes that there have been no permanent or temporary modifications to the containment structure, liner, or penetrations since the last Type A test that could adversely affect the Type A test results. No modifications that require a Type A test are planned before Refueling Outage 15. Also, there have been no pressure or temperature excursions in the containment that could have adversely affected containment integrity.

Based on the plant's Type A test performance history, as discussed above, the staff finds the licensee's proposal to delay the next Type A test until Refueling Outage 15 to be acceptable.

3.2 Use Of Bechtel Topical Report BN-TOP-1

NEI 94-01, Section 8.0, "Testing Methodologies for Type A, B, and C Tests," states that these tests should be performed using the technical methods and techniques specified in ANSI/ANS 56.8-1994, "or other alternative testing methods that have been approved by the NRC." Some licensees wish to use the alternative testing methodology contained in Bechtel Topical Report BN-TOP-1, Revision 1, "Testing Criteria For Integrated Leakage Rate Testing of Primary Containment Structures For Nuclear Power Plants," dated November 1, 1972. The staff approved use of BN-TOP-1 in 1972 and it has been used ever since, primarily because it allows Type A tests to be completed in as little as 6 hours instead of the typical 24 hours. Although Option B and ANSI/ANS 56.8-1994 allow tests as short as 8 hours and may be preferable to the dated methodology of BN-TOP-1, the licensee proposes to retain BN-TOP-1 as an option for performing Type A tests. BN-TOP-1 still provides acceptable results and, therefore, continues to be acceptable for plants under either Option A or Option B of Appendix J.

The proposed TS describe the use of BN-TOP-1 as an exception to Regulatory Guide 1.163. As an alternative testing method approved by the NRC, the use of BN-TOP-1 does not constitute an exception to Regulatory Guide 1.163. Nevertheless, the staff has no objection to specifically citing BN-TOP-1 in the TS so as to avoid any confusion as to its acceptability. Therefore, the staff finds the proposed TS concerning BN-TOP-1 to be acceptable.

3.3 Exceptions To The Model TS Guidance

3.3.1 Containment Purge/Vent Valves

It should be noted that the proposed TS set the Type C test interval for containment purge/vent valves to no more than 30 months. Although the model TS guidance provided in the NRC letter to NEI dated November 2, 1995, contains a requirement to perform leakage rate testing of containment purge valves every 6 months, the TS is in brackets, which means that it may or may not be applicable to a specific plant. The licensee's current TS do not contain a requirement for this more frequent leakage rate testing of containment purge/vent valves, which may be compared to the Appendix J, Option A frequency of once per refueling outage. Further, Option B of Appendix J, Regulatory Guide 1.163, and the subordinate guidance documents do not require the testing

of these valves more often than once per 30 months. Therefore, the proposed TS sets the test interval for containment purge/vent valves to no more than 30 months, through adherence to section C.2. of Regulatory Guide 1.163. The staff finds this to be acceptable.

3.3.2 As-Left and As-Found Leakage Rates

The model TS, in the Bases for TS 3.6.1.1.1, state:

Reviewer's Note: Regulatory Guide 1.163 and NEI 94-01 include acceptance criteria for as-left and as-found Type A leakage rates and combined Type B and C leakage rates, which may be reflected in the Bases.

As an extension of this concept, the licensee is proposing additional words, beyond the model TS, for TS 3.3.3, "Leakage Rate," and TS 6.16, "10 CFR 50 Appendix J Testing Program Plan," to reflect these acceptance criteria and proper means for determining as-left and as-found leakage rates. The staff has reviewed these additional words and finds that they are consistent with Regulatory Guide 1.163 and NEI 94-01, and are therefore acceptable.

3.3.3 Allowance For Exemptions

The program section of the model TS state that the program shall be in accordance with Appendix J, Option B, "as modified by approved exemptions." The licensee has proposed to leave out the phrase quoted above. Since the proposed TS is more conservative than the model TS, requiring compliance with Option B regardless of approved exemptions, the staff finds it to be acceptable.

3.3.4 Air Lock Leakage Rate Acceptance Criteria

The proposed TS 6.16, "10 CFR 50 Appendix J Testing Program Plan," deviates from the model TS in that it does not state separate, individual air lock leakage rate testing acceptance criteria. It also differs from current TS 4.3.3.d.(3)(d), which states: "Leakage rate for airlocks shall not exceed $0.05L_a$ at 35 psig." (Note: $P_a = 35$ psig.) Proposed TS 6.16 instead adds the measured air lock leakage rate to all of the other Type B and C leakage rates and requires that the sum be less than $0.6 L_a$.

The purpose for having separate, individual air lock leakage rate testing acceptance criteria is two-fold: to account for differing test pressures, and to provide better indications and corrections of degradation of air lock leak-tightness. At many plants, some air lock tests are performed at full pressure (P_a) and some at a lower pressure, usually 10 psig. It is difficult to compare leakage rates measured at different test pressures, so separate acceptance criteria for the two test pressures are preferable. Furthermore, separate, individual acceptance criteria provide better indication of degradation and require finer control of corrective action, compared to an overall, summary acceptance criterion for many components, which can mask individual problems.

At Nine Mile Point, Unit 1, all air lock tests are performed at one pressure, P_a . Also, individual administrative leakage rate limits in the licensee's program are required by the licensee's TS. These two circumstances ensure the fulfillment of the purpose of separate, individual acceptance criteria in the TS, and make them unnecessary.

Finally, the provisions of Option B of Appendix J and Regulatory Guide 1.163 do not require separate, individual air lock leakage rate testing acceptance criteria to be placed in the TS. Based on the foregoing, the staff finds the subject TS to be acceptable.

3.3.5 Continuous Integrated Leakage Rate Monitoring

The licensee proposes to delete current TS 4.3.3.f., "Continuous Leak Rate Monitoring," which contains requirements for a continuous integrated leakage rate monitoring, or on-line monitoring, system. The provisions of Option B of Appendix J, Regulatory Guide 1.163, and the model TS do not require the existence or operation of such a system. In fact, the staff considered at length the need for such systems during the rulemaking proceedings that produced Option B (e.g., see 60 FR 49497; NUREG-1493), and decided that on-line monitoring systems would not be required. Therefore, the staff finds the deletion of the on-line monitoring requirement to be acceptable.

3.4 Summary

In summary, the staff has reviewed the changes to the TS and associated Bases proposed by the licensee and finds that they are in compliance with the requirements of Appendix J, Option B, and are consistent with the guidance of Regulatory Guide 1.163, with the two exceptions reviewed above, and conform with the model TS except as noted above, and are, therefore, acceptable.

4.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the New York State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment changes a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes a surveillance requirement. The NRC staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluent 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 the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding (61 FR 52965). Accordingly, the amendment meets 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 the amendment.

6.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission has 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, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: J. Pulsipher

Date: February 10, 1997