Docket No. 50-245

Mr. W. G. Counsil, Vice President Nuclear Engineering and Operations Northeast Nuclear Energy Company Post Office Box 270 Hartford, Connecticut 06101

Dear Mr. Counsil:

SUBJECT: CONTAINMENT LEAKAGE RATE TESTING - APPENDIX J REVIEW (MILLSTONE UNIT 1)

We are continuing our review of your July 29, 1977 and September 20, 1978 submittals and request that you submit the information described in the enclosure to this letter within 30 days.

Sincerely,

Dennis M. Crutchfield, Chief Operating Reactors Branch #5 Division of Licensing

DISTRIBUTION Docket .

NRC PDR

Local PDR

Deisenhut rPurple TNovak RTedesco

GLainas

HSmsith

JShea

DELD OIEE (3)

ORB Reading

OCrutchfield

NSIC

TERA

ACRS (16)

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/enclosure: See next page

8103040291

OFFICE DE: ORB #5 WAS FORM I'M NO BOLNEY WILL



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

February 2, 1981

Docket No. 50-245 LS05-81-02-001

> Mr. W. G. Counsil, Vice President Nuclear Engineering and Operations Northeast Nuclear Energy Company Post Office Box 270 Hartford, Connecticut 06101

Dear Mr. Counsil:

SUBJECT: CONTAINMENT LEAKAGE RATE TESTING - APPENDIX J REVIEW (MILLSTONE UNIT 1)

We are continuing our review of your July 29, 1977 and September 20, 1978 submittals and request that you submit the information described in the enclosure to this letter within 30 days.

Sincerely,

Operating Reactors Branch #5

Division of Licensing

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/enclosure: See next page

cc w/enclosure:
William H. Cuddy, Esquire
Day, Berry & Howard
Counselors at Law
One Constitution Plaza
Hartford, Connecticut 06103

Natural Resources Defense Council 917 15th Street, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20005

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company ATTN: Superintendent Millstone Plant P. O. Box 128 Waterford, Connecticut 06385

Mr. James R. Himmelwright Northeast Utilities Service Company P. O. Box 270 Hartford, Connecticut 06101

Resident Inspector c/o U. S. NRC P. O. Box Drawer KK Niantic, Connecticut 06357

Waterford Public Library Rope Ferry Road, Route 156 Waterford, Connecticut 06385

First Selectman of the Town of Waterford Hall of Records 200 Boston Post Road Waterford, Connecticut 06385

John F. Opeka Systems Superintendent Northeast Utilities Service Company P. O. Box 270 Hartford, Connecticut 06101 Connecticut Energy Agency
ATTN: Assistant Director
Research and Policy
Development
Department of Planning and
Energy Policy
20 Grand Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

Director, Criteria and Standards
Division
Office of Radiation Programs
(ANR-460)
U. S. Environmental Protection
Agency
Washington, D. C. 20460

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Region I Office ATTN: EIS COORDINATOR JFK Federal Building Boston, Massachusetts 02203

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

CONTAINMENT LEAKAGE RATE TESTING

NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY MILLSTONE UNIT 1

NAC DOCKET NO. 50-245

NAC TAC NO. 10137

1. BACKGROUND

In letters dated July 29, 1977 and September 20, 1978, Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NECO) provided certain information in support of previously requested exemptions from the requirements of 10CFR50, Appendix J, Containment Leakage Testing.

2. INFORMATION REQUIRED

2.1 AIRLOCK TESTING

Item (2)a of NECO's July 29, 1977 letter regarding a request for exemption from the airlock-testing requirements of Appendix J stated that dirlock door seals would be tested at 10 psig within 72 hours of the first of a series of openings between 6-month tests.

Provide the method you propose to use to correlate the leakage rate of 10 psig to the leakage rate of 43 psig when performing these tests.

2.2 REVERSE DIRECTION TESTING

NECO's letter of September 20, 1978 states that valves LP-44A and B cannot be modified to meet the requirements for reverse direction testing; however, immediately adjacent valves LP-43A and B can be tested in the correct direction if test connections are added to each line. With respect to this proposal, i.e., to designate valves LP-43A and B as containment isolation valves in lieu of valves LP-44A and B, provide a comparison of valves LP-43A and B to valves LP-44A and B with regard to safety classification, seismic and environmental qualification, and automatic actuation features. Additionally, any differences in design classification of the piping between the 43 valves and 44 valves should be identified and discussed.