

December 4, 1995

Mr. Donald C. Shelton
Acting Vice President Nuclear - Perry
Centerior Service Company
P. O. Box 97, A200
Perry, OH 44081

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF EXEMPTION FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR PART 50,
APPENDIX J - PERRY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT 1 (TAC NO. M90683)

Dear Mr. Shelton:

The Commission has issued the enclosed exemptions for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, from certain requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Option A, in response to your letter dated October 21, 1994 (PY-CEI/NRR-1651L).

The Exemption will:

- a. Exclude main steam line isolation valve leakage from both the containment integrated leak rate (Type A) test and the combined local leak rate (Type B and C) tests, and clarify that the main steam lines are not required to be vented and drained for Type A testing;
- b. Decouple performance of the third Type A test from the shutdown for the 10-year plant inservice inspection; and
- c. Allow Type C testing to be performed at times other than during shutdown for refueling.

The Commission has granted these exemptions pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12. A copy of the Exemption is being forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:

Jon B Hopkins, Sr. Project Manager
Project Directorate III-3
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-440
Enclosure: Exemption
cc w/encl: See next page
DISTRIBUTION

Docket File
RZimmerman
WAxelson, RIII

PUBLIC
LSpessard
OGC

PDIII-3 r/f
JRoe
ACRS

WRussell/FMiraglia
BMcCabe
GHill (2)

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\PERRY\PER90683.EXP

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

OFFICE	LA:PDIII-3	E	PM:PDIII-3	E	BC:SCSB	OGC	D:PDIII-3	D:DRPW
NAME	DFoster-Curaen	DPickett	JHopkins	CBerlinger*	EHoller*	GMarcus	JRoe	
DATE	12/1/95	12/1/95	12/1/95	11/17/95	11/28/95	12/1/95	12/1/95	

* See previous concurrence

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

110055

9603120068 951204
PDR ADOCK 05000440
PDR

FILE FOR 11/18/95 COPY

DF01
13

Mr. Donald C. Shelton
Centerior Service Company

cc:

Jay E. Silberg, Esq.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
2300 N Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20037

Ms. Mary E. O'Reilly
Centerior Energy Corporation
300 Madison Avenue
Toledo, Ohio 43652

Resident Inspector's Office
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Parmlly at Center Road
Perry, Ohio 44081

Regional Administrator, Region III
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
801 Warrenville Road
Lisle, Illinois 60532-4531

Lake County Prosecutor
Lake County Administration Bldg.
105 Main Street
Painesville, Ohio 44077

Ms. Sue Hiatt
OCRE Interim Representative
8275 Munson
Mentor, Ohio 44060

Terry J. Lodge, Esq.
618 N. Michigan Street, Suite 105
Toledo, Ohio 43624

Ashtabula County Prosecutor
25 West Jefferson Street
Jefferson, Ohio 44047

Mr. James D. Kloosterman
Regulatory Affairs Manager
Cleveland Electric Illuminating
Company
Perry Nuclear Power Plant
P. O. Box 97, E-210
Perry, Ohio 44081

Mr. James R. Williams, Chief of
Staff
Ohio Emergency Management Agency
2825 West Granville Road
Worthington, Ohio 43085

Perry Nuclear Power Plant
Unit Nos. 1 and 2

Mr. James W. Harris, Director
Division of Power Generation
Ohio Dept. of Industrial Relations
P.O. Box 825
Columbus, Ohio 43216

The Honorable Lawrence Logan
Mayor, Village of Perry
4203 Harper Street
Perry, Ohio 44081

The Honorable Robert V. Orosz
Mayor, Village of North Perry
North Perry Village Hall
4778 Lockwood Road
North Perry Village, Ohio 44081

Attorney General
Department of Attorney General
30 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Radiological Health Program
Ohio Department of Health
P.O. Box 118
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0118

Ohio Environmental Protection
Agency
DERR--Compliance Unit
ATTN: Mr. Zack A. Clayton
P.O. Box 1049
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0149

Mr. Thomas Haas, Chairman
Perry Township Board of Trustees
3750 Center Rd., Box 65
Perry, Ohio 44081

State of Ohio
Public Utilities Commission
East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0573

Mr. Richard D. Brandt, Plant Manager
Cleveland Electric Illuminating
Company
Perry Nuclear Power Plant
P.O. Box 97, SB306
Perry, Ohio 44081

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of)	
)	
Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company,)	Docket No. 50-440
Centerior Service Company, Duquesne)	
Light Company, Ohio Edison Company,)	
Pennsylvania Power Company, Toledo)	
Edison Company)	
(Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1))	

EXEMPTION

I.

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, (the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License No. NPF-58, which authorizes operation of the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (PNPP). The operating license provides, among other things, that the licensee is subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission now and hereafter in effect.

The facility consists of a single boiling water reactor located at the licensee's site in Lake County, Ohio.

II.

Containment leak rate testing is necessary to demonstrate that the measured leak rate is within the acceptance criteria cited in the licensing design basis. Periodic testing of the overall containment structure along with separate leak testing of the penetrations provides assurance that post-accident radiological consequences will be within the limits of 10 CFR Part 100. The Commission's requirements regarding leak rate testing are found in Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50.

In its letter dated October 21, 1994, the licensee applied for partial exemptions from the Commission's regulations. The subject exemptions, which are from the requirements in Appendix J, Option A, to 10 CFR Part 50, include:

- Section III.A.5(b)(2) states that the measured leakage from the containment integrated leak rate (Type A) test (L_{am}) shall be less than 75% of the maximum allowable leakage rate ($0.75 L_a$).
- Sections III.B.3 and III.C.3 require that the combined leakage of valves and penetrations subject to Type B and C local leak rate testing be less than 0.6 times the maximum allowable leakage rate ($0.6 L_a$).
- Section III.A.1(d) requires that all fluid systems that would be open to containment following post-accident conditions, be vented and drained prior to conducting the containment integrated leak rate test.
- Section III.D.1(a) states that the third Type A test of each 10-year interval be conducted when the plant is shut down for the 10-year plant inservice inspection.
- Section III.D.3 states that Type C tests shall be performed during each reactor shutdown for refueling but in no case at intervals greater than 2 years. Type C tests are tests intended to measure containment isolation valve leakage rates.

III.

Section III.A.5(b)(2) states that the measured leakage from the containment integrated leak rate (Type A) test (L_{am}) shall be less than 75% of the maximum allowable leakage rate ($0.75 L_a$). The licensee proposes to exempt main steam line isolation valve leakage from Type A test results and consider leakage from the main steam lines separately. Sections III.B.3 and III.C.3

require that the combined leakage of valves and penetrations subject to Type B and C local leak rate testing be less than 0.6 times the maximum allowable leakage rate ($0.6 L_a$). The licensee proposes to exempt main steam line isolation valve leakage from the combined leakage from Type B and C local leak rate testing and consider leakage from the main steam lines separately. Section III.A.1(d) requires that all fluid systems that would be open to containment following post-accident conditions, be vented and drained prior to conducting Type A tests. The licensee proposes that the piping between the inboard and outboard main steam line isolation valves be flooded with water when Type A tests are conducted.

During the original staff review of the PNPP, the licensee proposed separate treatment of measured leakage past the main steam isolation valves. This approach is consistent with the staff's Standard Review Plan (SRP) 15.6.5, Appendix D, "Radiological Consequences of a Design Basis Loss-of-Coolant Accident: Leakage from Main Steam Isolation Valve Leakage Control System." In this SRP, the radiological consequences associated with leakage from the main steam lines is calculated separately and subsequently combined with the consequences from other fission product release paths.

As described in the Final Safety Analysis Report, the licensee calculates off-site dose consequences by assuming separate contributions from the containment integrated leak rate and the main steam line isolation valve leak rate. These assumptions are supported by the staff's Safety Evaluation Report (NUREG-0887) and the PNPP Technical Specifications. Both the FSAR and Specification 3.6.1.2.a state that the overall containment integrated leak rate shall be less than 0.20 percent per day. NUREG-0887 lists this same value for the containment integrated leak rate and a separate contribution

from main steam line leakage. Finally, Specification 3.6.1.2.b specifically states that main steam line leakage will not be considered part of the combined leak rate for penetrations and valves. Specification 3.6.1.2.c limits the maximum allowable leakage from each main steam line to 25 standard cubic feet per hour.

As described above, the licensee does not include leakage from the main steam line isolation valves in either the Type A test results or the combined Type B and C test results. Since the licensee measures main steam line leakage separately from other Appendix J related testing, the licensee does not want leakage from the main steam lines to inadvertently influence the Type A test results. Therefore, in lieu of venting and draining the piping between containment isolation valves as required by Appendix J, the licensee proposes filling this section of piping with water when Type A tests are performed. Filling these sections of pipe with water would ensure that air would not pass through these lines and thereby contribute to the Type A test results.

The licensee has proposed alternative methods to the leak testing requirements of Appendix J. While the licensee is treating main steam line leakage separately from both Type A test results and the combined Type B and C test results, the licensee still meets the intent of Appendix J by demonstrating that the overall leakage is within design limits. Therefore, the staff concludes that special circumstances are present as required by 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii), in that application of the regulation is not needed to meet the underlying purpose of the rule. Furthermore, the staff finds that permitting the alternative methods of leak testing will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety.

Section III.D.1(a) requires, in part, that "...a set of three Type A tests shall be performed, at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year service period. The third test of each set shall be conducted when the plant is shutdown for the 10-year plant inservice inspections." The licensee proposes to perform the three Type A tests at approximately equal intervals within each 10-year period, with the third test of each set conducted as close as practical to the end of the 10-year period. However, there would be no required connection between the Appendix J 10-year interval and the inservice inspection 10-year interval.

The 10-year plant inservice inspection (ISI) is the series of inspections performed every 10-years in accordance with Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and Addenda as required by 10 CFR 50.55a. The licensee performs the ISI volumetric, surface, and visual examinations of components and system pressure tests in accordance with 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(4) throughout the 10-year inspection interval. The major portion of this effort is presently being performed during the refueling outages. As a result, there is no extended outage in which the 10-year ISI examinations are performed.

There is no benefit to be gained by the coupling requirement cited above in that elements of the PNPP ISI program are conducted throughout each 10-year cycle rather than during a refueling outage at the end of the 10-year cycle. Consequently, the subject coupling requirement offers no benefit either to safety or to the economical operation of the facility.

Moreover, each of these two surveillance tests (i.e., the Type A tests and the 10-year ISI program) is independent of the other and provides assurances of different plant characteristics. The Type A test assures the required leak-tightness to demonstrate compliance with the guidelines of

10 CFR Part 100. The 10-year ISI program provides assurance of the integrity of the structures, systems and components as well as verifying operational readiness of pumps and valves in compliance with 10 CFR 50.55a. There is no safety-related concern necessitating their coupling in the same refueling outage. Accordingly, the staff finds that application of the regulation is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule.

On this basis, the staff finds that the licensee has demonstrated that there are special circumstances present as required by 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii). Further, the staff also finds that the uncoupling of the Type A tests from the 10-year ISI program will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety.

Section III.D.3 of Appendix J states that Type C tests shall be performed during each reactor shutdown for refueling but in no case at intervals greater than 2 years. The licensee requested relief from the requirement to perform Type C tests during each reactor shutdown for refueling. The licensee proposes to perform the required Type C tests while the plant is at power.

Section II.D.3 of Appendix J requires that "Type C tests shall be performed during each reactor shutdown for refueling but in no case at intervals greater than 2 years." Paragraph III.D.2 discusses the scheduling of Type B tests and contains the same wording but also includes an additional provision that allows Type B tests to be performed at "other convenient intervals" in lieu of during reactor shutdown for refueling. The licensee has requested that this same flexibility be applied to Type C local leak rate testing.

The underlying purpose of the rule is to ensure that adequate testing is done to demonstrate containment integrity. From the standpoint of testing adequacy, when the testing is performed is not significant because the conditions of testing are the same regardless of when it is performed. As indicated by the licensee, the BWR/6 Mark III containment/suppression pool design is such that Type C local leak rate testing can be performed during power operation on certain systems. In addition, the Drywell and Containment Purge System containment isolation valves have surveillance requirements imposed on them to demonstrate leak tightness during power operation. These surveillance tests are the same exact leak rate tests as the Type C local leak rate tests performed during refueling outages.

Taking credit for testing performed during power operation provides the same degree of assurance of containment integrity as taking credit for testing performed during shutdown. In addition, testing while at power may be preferable when considering ALARA and operability requirements. Therefore, the special circumstances of 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii) are present in that application of the regulation in this particular circumstance is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule.

IV.

The Commission has determined that pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a)(1) that this exemption is authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and is consistent with the common defense and security. The Commission further determines that special circumstances, as provided in 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii), are present justifying the exemption;

namely, that application of the regulation in this particular circumstance is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this Exemption will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment (60 FR 51821). This exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 4th day of December 1995.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:

Jack W. Roe, Director
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File	PUBLIC	PDIII-3 r/f	WRussell/FMiraglia
RZimmerman	LSpessard	JRoe	BMcCabe
WAxelson, RIII	OGC	ACRS	GHill (2)

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\PERRY\PER90683.EXP

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

OFFICE	LA:PDIII-3	PM:PDIII-3	PM:PDIII-3	BC:SCSB	OGC	D:PDIII-3	D:DRPW
NAME	DFoster-Cursen	DPickett	JHopkins*	CBerlinger*	EHoller*	GMarcus	JRoe
DATE	12/1/95	12/1/95	10/6/95	11/17/95	11/28/95	12/1/95	12/4/95

* See previous concurrence

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY