



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 82 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-66

DUQUESNE LIGHT COMPANY

OHIO EDISON COMPANY

PENNSYLVANIA POWER COMPANY

BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-334

Introduction

By letters dated July 14, 1983 and May 7, 1984, Duquesne Light Company (the licensee) applied for an amendment to Operating License DPR-66 to make a number of changes in the Technical Specifications. The following is an evaluation of the proposed changes to the Technical Specifications pertaining to containment air locks and the recently installed emergency air lock.

Discussion and Evaluation

The licensee proposes to revise the Action (Section 3.6.1.3) and Surveillance Requirements (Section 4.6.1.3) for the containment air locks.

Section 3.6.1.3

The Action statement would be changed to allow continued plant operation with one air lock door inoperable, provided that the operable air lock door is locked closed and verified to be locked closed at least once per 31 days. For the personnel air lock, a door will be locked closed by deactivating the hydraulically operated latches; for the emergency air lock this will be accomplished by physically locking the emergency egress air lock doors. Allowing continued plant operation with one air lock door inoperable for up to six months is acceptable since containment boundary integrity will be preserved by having the redundant, operable air lock door administratively controlled closed. (Locking the personnel air lock door would still leave the emergency manhole available for emergency escape from inside the containment. See Updated FSAR Section 5.2.4.8).

Section 4.6.1.3

This Section would be changed as follows: Subsection (a) would be amended to provide the option of performing door seal leak tests or an overall air lock leak test within 72 hours following each containment entry. A test pressure of 10 psig or greater for the emergency air lock door seals, and a door seal test pressure of greater than or equal to Pa (38.3 psig) for the personnel air lock are specified. The licensee states that the lower test

pressure for the emergency air lock door seal is the value recommended by the air lock manufacturer. Since the emergency air lock door is not equipped with strongbacks, testing at a pressure approaching Pa will tend to unseat the door. The proposed changes are acceptable.

Subsection (c) would be amended to establish an additional test requirement for the emergency air lock, in that the emergency air lock shaft seals would be tested at least once per 18 months during shutdown to provide added assurance of seal integrity. The acceptance criterion of this test is that there be no detectable leakage when the volume between the emergency airlock shaft seals is pressurized to greater than or equal to Pa (38.2 psig) for at least 2 minutes. The proposed criterion is acceptable.

The requested change to Subsection (b) would involve an exemption to the requirements of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50, Section III.D.2.(b)(ii), and will be addressed by a future action.

In summary, the licensee's proposed changes to Sections 3.6.1.3 and 4.6.1.3 of the Technical Specifications are administrative in nature and do not involve physical changes to the air locks. There is adequate assurance that containment boundary integrity will be preserved during plant operation, and that the leakage integrity of the air locks will be maintained. Therefore, we conclude that the proposed changes to the Technical Specifications are acceptable, as stated above.

#### Environmental Consideration

This amendment involves a change in the administrative procedure and requirements. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR Section 51.22(c)(10). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

#### Conclusion

We have 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, and (2) such activities

will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: November 8, 1984

Principal Contributor:

J. Guo