

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 8709110350 DOC. DATE: 87/09/01 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #  
 FACIL: 50-000 Generic Docket 05000000  
 50-269 Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Duke Power Co. 05000269  
 50-270 Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 2, Duke Power Co. 05000270  
 50-289 Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1, General Pu 05000289  
 50-369 William B. McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Duke Powe 05000369  
 50-370 William B. McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit 2, Duke Powe 05000370  
 50-413 Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Duke Power Co. 05000413  
 50-414 Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 2, Duke Power Co. 05000414

AUTH. NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION  
 TUCKER, H. B. Duke Power Co.  
 RECIP. NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION  
 Document Control Branch (Document Control Desk)

SUBJECT: Discusses containment integrated leak rate testing & imposition of backfit by virtue of change in staff position. Interpretations of 10CFR50, App J should be subjected to regulatory analysis.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A017D COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL 0 SIZE: 6  
 TITLE: OR Submittal: Append J Containment Leak Rate Testing

NOTES: AEOD/Ornstein: 1cy. 05000269  
 AEOD/Ornstein: 1cy. 05000270  
 R. Conte: 1cy. AEOD/ORNSTEIN: 1cy. 05000289  
 LPDR 2cys AMDTS to FSAR. ASLB 1cy. 05000413  
 LPDR 2cys AMDTS to FSAR. ASLB 1cy. 05000414

RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL
PD2-3 LA	1 0	PD1-4 LA	1 0
PD2-3 PD	5 5	PD1-4 PD	5 5
PASTIS, H	1 1	EDISON, G	1 1
HOOD, D	1 1	JABBOUR, K	1 1
INTERNAL: ACRS	10 10	ARM/DAF/LFMB	1 0
<u>NRR/DEST/PSB</u>	1 1	OGC/HDS2	1 1
<u>REG FILE</u> 01	1 1	RES DEPY GI	1 1
RES TELFORD, J	1 1	RES/DE/SSEB	1 1
RES/DRAA/SAIB	1 1	RES/DRPS/RPSIB	1 1
EXTERNAL: LPDR	4 4	NRC PDR	1 1
NSIC	1 1		
NOTES:	4 4		

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 45 ENCL 42

# DUKE POWER COMPANY

P.O. BOX 33189  
CHARLOTTE, N.C. 28242

HAL B. TUCKER  
VICE PRESIDENT  
NUCLEAR PRODUCTION

TELEPHONE  
(704) 373-4531

September 1, 1987

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Document Control Desk  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Subject: Oconee Nuclear Station  
Docket Nos. 50-269, -270, -289  
McGuire Nuclear Station  
Docket Nos. 50-369, -370  
Catawba Nuclear Station  
Docket Nos. 50-413, -414  
Containment Integrated Leak Rate Testing  
Imposition of Backfit by Virtue of  
Change in Staff Position

Gentlemen:

## SUMMARY

In recent months the NRC Staff has adopted various interpretations of 10CFR50 Appendix J which appear to be contrary to previous Staff Positions and which do not appear to be soundly based upon the text of Appendix J. Two items of particular concern to Duke Power are 1) the Staff's reluctance to allow short-duration tests using the Mass-Plot analysis method, and 2) the Staff's requirement that as-found (Type B and C) leakage be included in Type A test results. The purpose of this letter is to assert Duke's position that these interpretations constitute backfit requirements, as defined by 10CFR50.109, and as such should be subjected to the Regulatory Analysis required by §50.109.

## DISCUSSION

In 1973, 10CFR50 Appendix J went into effect, referencing ANSI N45.4-1972 (Leakage-Rate Testing of Containment Structures for Nuclear Reactors) as the operative method for performing Leak-Rate Testing at nuclear stations. Since that time Duke has performed leak-rate testing according to Appendix J, with some exemptions.

As time and technology have progressed, the NRC Staff has supplemented the requirements of Appendix J through Staff Positions, both tacit and explicit, which become backfitted requirements when enforced. For example in 1977 the Staff, absent any revision to Appendix J, began requiring that Integrated Leak Rate Test (ILRT) acceptance criteria include a 95 percent Upper Confidence Limit (UCL), rather than actual measured leakage. Inspection of Appendix J and ANSI N45.4-1972 reveals no mention of UCL. This requirement was presumably based on the then-draft revision to the standard, which was issued in 1981 as ANSI/ANS-56.8. Clearly, had the backfit rule been in effect in 1977 the imposition of the more stringent UCL requirement would have been considered as such.

8709110350 870901  
PDR ADDOCK 05000269  
PDR

A017  
1/0

Another example of a changed Staff position as it affects Appendix J testing relates to the method used to analyze ILRT data. ANSI N45.4-1972 requires that either the "total time" or the "point-to-point" method be used to analyze ILRT data. However, starting in 1976 the Staff endorsed, again absent any revision to Appendix J, the Mass-Plot (Mass-Point) method. As late as 1986 (reference: Staff Review of Leak-rate Methodology, Deputy Director, NRR to Director, Div. of Inspection Programs, IE, April 1, 1986) the Staff has recognized the acceptability of the Mass-Plot method. On August 1, 1986 Duke was notified by the Staff that Mass-Plot was not an acceptable analysis method because Mass-Plot was not provided for in Appendix J. Duke had already obtained exemptions to allow use of Mass-Plot at the McGuire and Catawba stations, and subsequently obtained an exemption for Oconee.

The preceding two examples illustrate instances in which "Staff Position" has achieved virtually regulatory status without being accorded the due process required for rulemaking. Fortunately, neither has to date resulted in significant adverse impact. There are, however, two issues related to ILRTs which loom as significant contributors to increased probability of test failure and increased outage time. These issues are short-duration Mass-Plot testing and inclusion of as-found leakage from Type B and C testing in Type A test results.

Appendix J, through ANSI-N45.4, requires that ILRTs be performed for a 24-hour period, except "if it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of those responsible for the acceptance of the containment structure that the leakage rate can be accurately determined during a shorter test period, the agreed-upon shorter period may be used." (ANSI-N45.4, paragraph 7.6). There are two important points in this exception. First, the exception is made without reference to the method of test analysis contained in the standard. Second, the exception refers to "those responsible for the acceptance of the containment structure." The NRC Staff, in its April 1, 1986 review of leak rate testing methodology stated that the only test of less than 24 hours which is acceptable to the NRC is the method specified in the Bechtel Corporation Topical, BN-TOP-1 (the total time and point-to-point methods). The Staff further contends that "those responsible for acceptance of the containment structure" refers to the NRC. In Inspection Report Number 50-269/86-13 (June 30, 1986) the Staff states "ANSI-N45.4, paragraph 7.6 requires a 24-hour test unless a test of shorter duration has been agreed upon by NRC." The Report also states "The Region believes that the second sentence [of paragraph 7.6] is simply a statement of the obvious; specifically, that with the review and approval of the regulatory body that initially approved the rule, in this case the NRC, an acceptable alternative to the requirements of that rule may be implemented."

It is not obvious at all that "those responsible for the acceptance of the containment structure" and "the regulatory body that approved the rule" are one and the same. The licensee is responsible for the operation, maintenance, and overall quality of the nuclear station. Acceptance of the containment structure is one aspect of the licensee's responsibility to assure that the health and safety of the public is not endangered. The ability to verify this acceptability in less than 24 hours, using Mass-Plot, has been explicitly recognized in the revised standard ANSI/ANS-56.8-1981, "Containment System Leakage Testing Requirements." It is implicit in the current standard, N45.4-1972, that if the acceptance criteria are met, the test duration is irrelevant.

The recent unwillingness of the Staff to accept short duration Mass-Plot testing represents a change in Staff position. The table below lists two Inspection Reports in which the NRC Inspector witnessed and, by signing the report with no related violations or identified items, tacitly approved short-duration tests using Mass-Plot.

<u>REPORT NO.</u>	<u>REPORT DATE</u>	<u>TEST DURATION</u>	<u>MINIMUM TEST DURATION PER PROCEDURE</u>
50-270/83-35	Dec. 15, 1983	8 hours 25 min.	6 hours
50-287/81-04	April 6, 1981	10 hours 45 min.	Not in procedure

Note that the inspector(s) reviewed at least one procedure which specified a minimum 6-hour test.

As noted, the provision in the standard to allow short duration testing did not make reference to any of the analysis methods included in the standard. In addition to the total time and point-to-point methods (two options in the broader category of the absolute method) the Standard describes testing by the Reference-Vessel Method. The Reference-Vessel Method is distinctly different from the absolute method; nevertheless, the Standard, in paragraph 7.10, reaffirms that "If it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of those responsible for the acceptance of the containment that the leakage rate can be accurately determined during a shorter test period, the agreed upon shorter period may be used". It follows that if two diverse methods have the capability to satisfactorily determine leakage rates in less than 24 hours, then the duration of the test is not as critical a parameter as the April, 1986 Staff position seems to indicate.

In accordance with the backfit policy guidance presented in Chapter 0514 of the NRC Manual, the elements of imposition of a backfit are satisfied. The Staff's original position of acceptance of short duration testing is documented in the above inspection reports. The Staff's new position is documented in the April, 1986 Staff review of leakrate methodology. Actual imposition of the backfit has been accomplished by the need to perform 24-hour tests or risk ILRT failure. The previous Staff position had been in effect since the inception of Appendix J.

The issue of as-found leakage has already proven significant at McGuire Nuclear Station, where one unit was ruled to have failed an ILRT by virtue of having not included as-found leakage in Type A test results. The Staff's position, established in Information Notice 85-71, was identified too close in time to a scheduled ILRT to allow resolution in a timely manner. Information Notice 85-71 was dated August 22, 1985; before the effective date of 10 CFR 50.109 (October 21, 1985). However, the backfit policy identified in Generic Letter 84-08, which is similar to 50.109, is applicable to this issue.

Appendix J appears to have been predicated upon the intent of assuring containment integrity for the period of operation following the test. The acceptance criteria for the test require that the measured leakage (LTM) rate be 75% of the allowable leakage (LT) rate. Thus, assuming a nominal degradation (25%) of containment integrity over the subsequent period, the leakage will still be within the allowable limits at the conclusion of the period.

The inclusion of as-found leakage in Type A test results thus causes a double-counting of normal (anticipated) containment integrity degradation. The .75 La acceptance criterion of Appendix J concedes an acceptable amount of expected degradation. To further require that the actual degradation of the containment (i.e., the as-found leakage) result in a total leakage of less than .75 La, rather than La, is beyond the intent of the rule. Any other interpretation must refute the definition of La as an acceptable leakage and .75 La as an acceptance criterion.

The periodic testing and maintenance which is performed only serves to reinforce the probability of sound containment integrity. The Staff apparently accepted this philosophy for many years; as indicated by the fact the NRC inspectors have reviewed test procedures and witnessed ILRTs, and have not (until recently) identified any deviations or violations. There appears to be a shift in the philosophy of the intent of Appendix J from ensuring future operability to verification of past operability. It may be valid that future operability may best be expected based upon past history of containment leakage. It may also be that this new philosophy of verifying past operability results in penalization for utilities' valve maintenance programs by increasing the time required to perform Type B and C testing, increasing the possibility of Type A test failure, and thus increasing the Type A test frequency. In fact, the valve and penetration maintenance program will accomplish the same goal as the ILRT program, without subjecting the utility to the economic risks (i.e., increased outage time) associated with ILRT failure.

An example of the Staff's previous position that Type C as-found leakages need not be included in ILRT test results can be found in Information Report 50-269/80-06, transmitted to Duke by letter, R.C. Lewis to W.O. Parker, dated March 20, 1980. The inspector noted that 14 of 60 penetrations were not aligned as required for ILRT. As a result, the inspector required that the as-found leakage from those 14 valves be included in the ILRT results. As-found leakage from the 46 valves which were properly aligned were not required to be included. This specific exclusion of valves from the as-found testing requirement serves as documentation of a previous Staff position that as found valve leakage need not be included in ILRT results. Again, the Staff position presented in Information Notice 85-71 represents a departure from that position and should receive the appropriate analysis to determine that there is a substantial increase in the overall protection of the public health and safety from the imposition of this backfit.

#### CONCLUSION

The Staff's original positions on short duration Mass-Plot Testing and as-found leakage are documented in the various inspection reports referenced elsewhere in this letter. By approving the inspection reports with no applicable violations or deviations identified, the Staff has tacitly approved short-duration Mass-Plot Testing and ILRTs without as-found leakage. More recent Staff documents, notably the April 1, 1986 Staff review of leakage methodology and Inspection Notice 85-71, change Staff position in such a way as to place additional burden on Licensees without demonstrating that a significant increase in overall protection of public health and safety will be achieved. Duke considers that these issues are backfits and should receive the appropriate regulatory analysis. This analysis should compare the cost of the increased outage time associated with extended leak rate

1982  
 1983  
 1984  
 1985  
 1986  
 1987  
 1988  
 1989  
 1990  
 1991  
 1992  
 1993  
 1994  
 1995  
 1996  
 1997  
 1998  
 1999  
 2000  
 2001  
 2002  
 2003  
 2004  
 2005  
 2006  
 2007  
 2008  
 2009  
 2010  
 2011  
 2012  
 2013  
 2014  
 2015  
 2016  
 2017  
 2018  
 2019  
 2020  
 2021  
 2022  
 2023  
 2024  
 2025  
 2026  
 2027  
 2028  
 2029  
 2030  
 2031  
 2032  
 2033  
 2034  
 2035  
 2036  
 2037  
 2038  
 2039  
 2040  
 2041  
 2042  
 2043  
 2044  
 2045  
 2046  
 2047  
 2048  
 2049  
 2050  
 2051  
 2052  
 2053  
 2054  
 2055  
 2056  
 2057  
 2058  
 2059  
 2060  
 2061  
 2062  
 2063  
 2064  
 2065  
 2066  
 2067  
 2068  
 2069  
 2070  
 2071  
 2072  
 2073  
 2074  
 2075  
 2076  
 2077  
 2078  
 2079  
 2080  
 2081  
 2082  
 2083  
 2084  
 2085  
 2086  
 2087  
 2088  
 2089  
 2090  
 2091  
 2092  
 2093  
 2094  
 2095  
 2096  
 2097  
 2098  
 2099  
 2100  
 2101  
 2102  
 2103  
 2104  
 2105  
 2106  
 2107  
 2108  
 2109  
 2110  
 2111  
 2112  
 2113  
 2114  
 2115  
 2116  
 2117  
 2118  
 2119  
 2120  
 2121  
 2122  
 2123  
 2124  
 2125  
 2126  
 2127  
 2128  
 2129  
 2130  
 2131  
 2132  
 2133  
 2134  
 2135  
 2136  
 2137  
 2138  
 2139  
 2140  
 2141  
 2142  
 2143  
 2144  
 2145  
 2146  
 2147  
 2148  
 2149  
 2150  
 2151  
 2152  
 2153  
 2154  
 2155  
 2156  
 2157  
 2158  
 2159  
 2160  
 2161  
 2162  
 2163  
 2164  
 2165  
 2166  
 2167  
 2168  
 2169  
 2170  
 2171  
 2172  
 2173  
 2174  
 2175  
 2176  
 2177  
 2178  
 2179  
 2180  
 2181  
 2182  
 2183  
 2184  
 2185  
 2186  
 2187  
 2188  
 2189  
 2190  
 2191  
 2192  
 2193  
 2194  
 2195  
 2196  
 2197  
 2198  
 2199  
 2200  
 2201  
 2202  
 2203  
 2204  
 2205  
 2206  
 2207  
 2208  
 2209  
 2210  
 2211  
 2212  
 2213  
 2214  
 2215  
 2216  
 2217  
 2218  
 2219  
 2220  
 2221  
 2222  
 2223  
 2224  
 2225  
 2226  
 2227  
 2228  
 2229  
 2230  
 2231  
 2232  
 2233  
 2234  
 2235  
 2236  
 2237  
 2238  
 2239  
 2240  
 2241  
 2242  
 2243  
 2244  
 2245  
 2246  
 2247  
 2248  
 2249  
 2250  
 2251  
 2252  
 2253  
 2254  
 2255  
 2256  
 2257  
 2258  
 2259  
 2260  
 2261  
 2262  
 2263  
 2264  
 2265  
 2266  
 2267  
 2268  
 2269  
 2270  
 2271  
 2272  
 2273  
 2274  
 2275  
 2276  
 2277  
 2278  
 2279  
 2280  
 2281  
 2282  
 2283  
 2284  
 2285  
 2286  
 2287  
 2288  
 2289  
 2290  
 2291  
 2292  
 2293  
 2294  
 2295  
 2296  
 2297  
 2298  
 2299  
 2300  
 2301  
 2302  
 2303  
 2304  
 2305  
 2306  
 2307  
 2308  
 2309  
 2310  
 2311  
 2312  
 2313  
 2314  
 2315  
 2316  
 2317  
 2318  
 2319  
 2320  
 2321  
 2322  
 2323  
 2324  
 2325  
 2326  
 2327  
 2328  
 2329  
 2330  
 2331  
 2332  
 2333  
 2334  
 2335  
 2336  
 2337  
 2338  
 2339  
 2340  
 2341  
 2342  
 2343  
 2344  
 2345  
 2346  
 2347  
 2348  
 2349  
 2350  
 2351  
 2352  
 2353  
 2354  
 2355  
 2356  
 2357  
 2358  
 2359  
 2360  
 2361  
 2362  
 2363  
 2364  
 2365  
 2366  
 2367  
 2368  
 2369  
 2370  
 2371  
 2372  
 2373  
 2374  
 2375  
 2376  
 2377  
 2378  
 2379  
 2380  
 2381  
 2382  
 2383  
 2384  
 2385  
 2386  
 2387  
 2388  
 2389  
 2390  
 2391  
 2392  
 2393  
 2394  
 2395  
 2396  
 2397  
 2398  
 2399  
 2400  
 2401  
 2402  
 2403  
 2404  
 2405  
 2406  
 2407  
 2408  
 2409  
 2410  
 2411  
 2412  
 2413  
 2414  
 2415  
 2416  
 2417  
 2418  
 2419  
 2420  
 2421  
 2422  
 2423  
 2424  
 2425  
 2426  
 2427  
 2428  
 2429  
 2430  
 2431  
 2432  
 2433  
 2434  
 2435  
 2436

Hal B. Tucker

SAG/84/jgc

xc: Dr. J. Nelson Grace, Regional Administrator  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission - Region II  
101 Marietta Street, Suite 2900  
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Executive Director for Operations  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dr. K.N. Jabbour, Project Manager  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Ms. Helen Pastis, Project Manager  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. Darl Hood, Project Manager  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. P.K. Van Doorn  
NRC Resident Inspector  
Catawba Nuclear Station

Mr. W.T. Orders  
NRC Resident Inspector  
McGuire Nuclear Station

Mr. J.C. Bryant  
NRC Resident Inspector  
Oconee Nuclear Station

USNRC-DS

1987 SEP 11 A 9:27