

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKETED
USNRC

ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARD
82 NOV 22 P1:46

Administrative Judges:

Thomas S. Moore, Chairman
Dr. John H. Buck
Stephen F. Eilperin

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

In the Matter of)

PENNSYLVANIA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY)

and)

ALLEGHENY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.)

(Susquehanna Steam Electric Station,)
Units 1 and 2)

SERVED NOV 22 1982

Docket Nos. 50-387 OL
50-388 OL

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

November 22, 1982

(ALAB-702)

In previous orders in this proceeding, we disposed of the parties' appeals from the Licensing Board's April 12, 1982 initial decision (LBP-82-30, 15 NRC 771) authorizing an operating license. First, on September 16 we granted the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's motion to withdraw its exceptions to the initial decision. We took that step after accepting the settlement agreement proffered to us by the Commonwealth and the applicants, which settled their dispute involving the quantities and types of dosimetry available for offsite emergency workers. Thereafter in ALAB-693, 16 NRC ___ (Sept. 28, 1982), we dismissed the appeal of intervenor, Citizens Against Nuclear Dangers (CAND), for

failure to brief its exceptions adequately. We noted, however, that the Licensing Board's initial decision would not become final until we completed our pending sua sponte review.

In connection with that review, we issued an order on October 26 requesting certain information from the applicants and NRC staff concerning the leak rate monitoring system at Unit 1 of the Susquehanna facility. The order recited the substance of applicants' testimony that the applicants would implement a system to detect increases in unidentified leakage in the reactor coolant system of more than one gallon per minute in any hour, and that the plant would be shut down for inspection in conformance with the technical specifications if a leak rate change of that magnitude were discovered. Our review, however, uncovered no technical specifications for Unit 1 containing a limiting condition of operation addressed to an increase in the rate of unidentified leakage. We therefore requested that the applicants inform us how they intend to implement the leak rate monitoring system discussed at the hearing. In addition, we requested that the staff tell us how and where the Susquehanna technical specifications dealt with this issue and the relationship of the plant's technical specifications to NUREG-0313, Rev. 1, and the agency's standard technical specifications.

The applicants have now informed us that their witness' statement to the Licensing Board at the hearing below regarding the leak detection system "was (and is) incorrect" and that "the error was carried forward in Applicants' proposed findings and the Licensing Board's Initial Decision." Response (Nov. 2, 1982) at 3 (footnotes omitted). The applicants' response then states that the correct answer to the Board's question

should have stated that the leak detection system is capable of detecting leakages of 1 gpm, that the technical specifications will require plant shutdown for unidentified leakage of 5 gpm, and that the technical specifications will also require plant shutdown if unidentified leakage increases by 2 gpm or more in a four-hour period.

Id. According to the applicants, this answer is consistent with the Final Safety Analysis Report and the staff's recommendations in NUREG-0313, Rev. 1.

The applicants' response also indicates that, although the current technical specifications for Unit 1 include a 5 gpm limit on unidentified leakage and a 25 gpm (averaged over a 24-hour period) limit on the total leakage, the Unit 1 technical specifications do not include any limit on the rate of increase in unidentified leakage. They, however, "recognize that such a limit should be included in order to be consistent with NUREG-0313, Rev. 1, and are now preparing a proposed amendment which would include in the Unit 1 Technical Specifications a limitation on the increase in


unidentified reactor coolant system leakage of 2 gpm within a four-hour period." Id. at 3-4. The staff's response to our order also indicates the need for an amendment of the Unit 1 technical specifications.

We concur in the need for amending the technical specifications for Unit 1 to include a limiting condition for operation that restricts increases in unidentified leakage to no more than 2 gpm in any four-hour period. Accordingly, the applicants shall inform us when they file their proposed amendment and the staff shall notify us when it acts on the applicants' proposal. We expect both the applicants and the staff to act expeditiously.

This completes our sua sponte review. We have reviewed the record and, with the exception of the matter above, have found no other errors requiring corrective action.

It is so ORDERED.

FOR THE APPEAL BOARD


C. Jean Sheemaker
Secretary to the
Appeal Board