REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 8607070446 DOC. DATE: 86/06/24 NOTARIZED: YES DOCKET #
FACIL: 50-410 Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 2, Niagara Moha 05000410
AUTH. NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
MANGAN, C. V. Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.
RECIP. NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
ADENSAN, E. G. BWR Project Directorate 3

SUBJECT: Requests exemption from requirements of 10CFR50, App J re relaxation of testing requirements for airlock doors during period when containment integrity not needed.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: B001D COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 6
TITLE: Licensing Submittal: PSAR/FSAR Amdts & Related Correspondence

NOTES:

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME		COPIES LTTR	COPIES ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME		COPIES LTTR	COPIES ENCL
	BWR EB		1	1	BWR EICSB		2	2
	BWR FOB		1	1	BWR PD3 LA		1	1
	BWR PD3 PD		1	1	HAUGHEY, M	01	2	2
	BWR PSB		1	1	BWR RSB		1	1
INTERNAL:	ACRS	41	6	6	ADM/LFMB		1	0
	ELD/HDS3		1	0	IE FILE		1	1
	IE/DEPER/EPB	36	1	1	IE/DQAVT/QAB	21	1	1
	NRR BWR ADTS		1	0	NRR PWR-B ADTS		1	0
	~~NRR/PAE, M L~~		1	1	NRR/DHFT/MTB		1	1
	REG FILE	04	1	1	RGN1		3	3
	RM/DDAMI/MIB		1	0				
EXTERNAL:	BNL(AMDTS ONLY)		1	1	DMB/DSS (AMDTS)		1	1
	LPDR	03	1	1	NRC PDR	02	1	1
	NSIC	05	1	1	PNL GRUEL, R		1	1

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 36 ENCL 31

NIAGARA MOHAWK

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION/300 ERIE BOULEVARD WEST, SYRACUSE, N.Y. 13202/TELEPHONE (315) 474-1511

June 24, 1986
(NMP2L 0757)

Ms. Elinor G. Adensam, Director
BWR Project Directorate No. 3
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
7920 Norfolk Avenue
Washington, DC 20555

Dear Ms. Adensam:

Re: Nine Mile Point Unit 2
Docket No. 50-410

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation ("Niagara Mohawk") hereby requests exemptions pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a) from specific requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J. Specifically, Niagara Mohawk requests the relaxation of testing requirements for airlock doors such that they need not be tested in accordance with Section III.D.2(b) (ii) if opened during a period when containment integrity is not required at the end of such period.

The exemption has been reviewed and found to be authorized by law and consistent with the common defense and security. The attachment to this letter demonstrates that the requested exemption presents no undue risk to the health and safety of the public and that special circumstances are present that justify granting the exemption.

With regard to the "common defense and security" standard, the grant of the requested exemption is consistent with the common defense and security of the United States. The Commission's Statement of Considerations in support of the exemption rule notes with approval the explanation of this standard as set forth in Long Island Lighting Company (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), LBP-84-45, 20 NRC 1343, 1400 (October 29, 1984). There, the term "common defense and security" refers principally to the safeguarding of special nuclear material, the absence of foreign control over the applicant, the protection of Restricted data, and the availability of special nuclear material for defense needs. The granting of the requested exemption will not affect any of these matters, and thus, such a grant is consistent with the common defense and security.

B001
1/1

The proposed exemption has been analyzed and determined not to cause additional construction or operational activities which may significantly affect the environment. It does not result in a significant increase in any adverse environmental impact previously evaluated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement - Operating License Stage, a significant change in effluents or power levels or a matter not previously reviewed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission which may have a significant adverse environmental impact.

The information contained in this letter supersedes the information concerning the proposed exemption requested in our letter dated March 3, 1986. Niagara Mohawk is ready to meet with the cognizant Nuclear Regulatory Commission personnel to review these matters should you require additional information.

Very truly yours,

cvmangan

C. V. Mangan
Senior Vice President

NLR:ja
1718G

Attachment
xc: R. A. Gramm, NRC Resident Inspector
Project File (2)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of	)	
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation	)	Docket No. 50-410
(Nine Mile Point Unit 2)	)	

AFFIDAVIT

C. V. Mangan, being duly sworn, states that he is Senior Vice President of Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation; that he is authorized on the part of said Corporation to sign and file with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission the documents attached hereto; and that all such documents are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information and belief.

C V Mangan

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public in and for the State of New York and County of Onondaga, this 24th day of June, 1986.

Christine Austin
Notary Public in and for
Onondaga County, New York

My Commission expires:
CHRISTINE AUSTIN
Notary Public in the State of New York
Qualified in Onondaga Co. No. 4787687
My Commission Expires March 30, 1987

CHRISTINE AUSTIN
Notary Public in the State of New York
Qualified in Onondaga Co. No. 4707687
My Commission Expires March 30, 19__

EXEMPTION REQUEST

Airlock Testing

10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.2(b) (ii) requires air locks that have been used during periods when containment integrity is not required by the plant's Technical Specifications to be tested at the end of such periods at not less than Pa. It is requested that an exemption from that requirement be issued. 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Section III.D.2(b) describes the periodic retest schedule for containment air locks. This schedule is specifically implemented in Technical Specification 4.6.1.3 with the following exception. In addition to the six month intervals, air locks will be subjected to an overall air lock leakage integrity test when maintenance has been performed on the air lock that could affect the air lock sealing capability. This is at variance with Paragraph III.D.2(b) (ii) of Appendix J which requires testing of air locks at the end of periods when primary containment integrity is not required regardless of whether or not maintenance is performed on the air lock.

This exemption request is justified for the following reasons. An air lock leakage test at Pa will be performed at least once per six months (Technical Specification 4.6.1.3.b) to verify that the overall air lock leakage rate is within applicable limits. This periodic test will verify that the sealing capability of the air lock has not degraded as a result of a routine use since the last time the test was conducted.

Tests conducted on the air lock at the end of periods when primary containment integrity is not required, during which no maintenance has been performed on the air lock that could affect its sealing capability, serve only to confirm the periodic six month surveillance requirement and in effect establish an unnecessarily restrictive surveillance interval. To assure air lock leakage is within specified limits, an air lock leakage test at Pa will be performed prior to establishing primary containment integrity when maintenance has been performed on the air lock that could affect its sealing capability (Technical Specification 4.6.1.3.b), and an air lock seal test will be performed within 72 hours following each closure, except when the air lock is being used for multiple entries and then at least once per 72 hours (Technical Specification 4.6.1.3.a).

These requirements assure that when replacements, modifications or other alterations to the air lock are made which may affect sealing capability, surveillances will be conducted to verify that the air lock satisfies the acceptance criterion.

Other considerations supporting the grant of the exemption are the reliability inherent in the design and the remaining leak test requirements outlined above, and the increased critical path time due to the necessity to install strongbacks on the doors while conducting an overall airlock leak test. Therefore, testing of the air locks prior to establishing primary containment integrity if no maintenance has been performed on the air lock's seal capability is an unnecessary, repetitive test. Its elimination would present no undue risk to the public health and safety.

Special Circumstances are Present Which Warrant Issuance of the Requested Exemptions

Special circumstances are present which warrant issuance of the requested exemption. These special circumstances are discussed in accordance with the classification contained in the rule.

> (ii) Application of the regulation in the particular circumstances ... is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule;

The underlying purpose of the rule is to assure a low leakage containment with the ultimate objective of keeping accident doses low. The air lock doors have been demonstrated to meet the design basis criteria for air leakage. Even were the exemption to be granted, the tests that are still required assure the integrity of the airlock doors. Thus, special circumstances are present which warrant granting the exemptions.

> (iii) Compliance would result in undue hardship or other costs that are significantly in excess of those contemplated when the regulation was adopted, or that are significantly in excess of those incurred by others similarly situated;

The necessity of repeated installation and removal of strongbacks required for testing air locks at Pa and the extended time to conduct a full air lock test creates an undue hardship not contemplated when the regulation was adopted. The proposed testing of the seals does not require the installation of strongbacks, can be quickly performed, and achieves the same results - the assurance of containment integrity. Also, since others have been granted relief from this requirement as written, not granting relief for NMP2 would result in costs and hardship in excess of that incurred by others.