



Duquesne Light

Nuclear Construction Division
Robinson Plaza, Building 2, Suite 210
Pittsburgh, PA 15205

2NRC-4-038
(412) 787-5141
(412) 923-1960
Telecopy (412) 787-2629
April 10, 1984

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

ATTENTION: Mr. George W. Knighton, Chief
Licensing Branch 3
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: Beaver Valley Power Station - Unit 2
Docket No. 50-412
Open Item/Question Response

Gentlemen:

This letter forwards responses to the issues listed below. Duquesne Light Company plans to incorporate the responses to the FSAR question into FSAR Amendment 6. The following items are attached:

Attachment 1: Response to Question 430.119 (Power Systems Branch) forwarded by your letter dated September 19, 1984.

Attachment 2: Response to Open Item 57 of the Beaver Valley Power Station Unit No. 2 Draft Safety Evaluation Report.

DUQUESNE LIGHT COMPANY

By

E. J. Woolever
Vice President

KAT/wjs

cc: Mr. H. R. Denton, Director NRR
Mr. D. Eisenhut, Director Division of Licensing
Mr. G. Walton, NRC Resident Inspector
Mr. M. Lacitra, Project Manager

8404160066 840410
PDR ADJCK 05000412
E PDR

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS
10th DAY OF April, 1984.

Notary Public

ANITA ELAINE REITER, NOTARY PUBLIC
ROBINSON TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES OCTOBER 20, 1986

3001
11

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA)
) SS:
COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY)

On this 9th day of April, 1984, before me,
a Notary Public in and for said Commonwealth and County, personally
appeared E. J. Woolever, who being duly sworn, deposed and said that (1) he
is Vice President of Duquesne Light, (2) he is duly authorized to execute
and file the foregoing Submittal on behalf of said Company, and (3) the
statements set forth in the Submittal are true and correct to the best of
his knowledge.

Anita Elaine Reiter
Notary Public

ANITA ELAINE REITER, NOTARY PUBLIC
ROBINSON TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES OCTOBER 20, 1985

ATTACHMENT 1

Question 430.119 (SRP 9.5.7)

In Sections 9.5.7.2 and 9.5.7.5 of the FSAR you discuss the level alarms associated with the lube oil system. You state that "the rocker arm lube oil reservoir level is monitored for high level and the level is maintained by a lever control valve." No mention is made of a reservoir low level alarm. A failure of the level control valve to maintain lube oil level in the rocker arm reservoir could result in inadequate or no lubricating oil for the rocker arms, leading to diesel generator unavailability and/or failure. This is an unacceptable condition. Provide a low level alarm for the rocker arm lube oil reservoir (SRP 9.5.7, Part III).

Response:

A rocker arm lube oil low pressure alarm is provided to alert the operator of conditions such as low rocker arm lube oil reservoir level. The level control valve is a float valve which tends to be pushed open by inlet oil pressure. The valve opening is further assured by the length of the float rod and weight of the float which provide sufficient mechanical advantage to force the valve open reliably.

ATTACHMENT 2

OPEN ITEM 57

7.3.3.2 Test of Engineered Safeguards P-4 Interlock

On November 7, 1979, Westinghouse notified the Commission of an undetectable failure that could exist in the engineered safeguards P-4 interlocks. Test procedures were developed to detect failures that might occur. The procedures require the use of voltage measurements at the terminal blocks of the reactor trip breaker cabinets.

The staff raised a concern on the possibility of accidental shorting or grounding of safety system circuits during testing of the P-4 interlocks. The applicant is studying this issue. This item is open, subject to staff review of the applicant's pending response.

Response:

Beaver Valley Unit 2 plans to test the P-4 interlock by using the testing procedure recommended by Westinghouse. This procedure has been satisfactorily used at Beaver Valley Unit 1 for approximately four years.

The experience gained on BVPS-1 has indicated that accidental shorting or grounding of safety system circuits is not a problem. Therefore, the proposed modification to the breakers does not provide substantial additional protection which is required for the public health and safety.