



Commonwealth Edison

1400 Opus Place
Downers Grove, Illinois 60515

January 25, 1995

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Attn: Document Control Desk

Subject: Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station Units 1 and 2
Generic Letter 92-01, Supplement 1, "Reactor Vessel Structural Integrity"
NRC Docket Nos. 50-254/265

- References:
- (a) J. Stang to D. Farrar letter, dated April 14, 1994.
 - (b) P. Piet to W. Russell letter dated August 11, 1994.
 - (c) Teleconference between ComEd (J. Schrage, et al) and NRC (R. Pulsifer, et al) on October 20, 1994.
 - (d) J.L. Schrage to USNRC letter dated December 6, 1994.
 - (e) M.A. Jackson to USNRC letter dated July 1, 1992, ComEd response to Generic Letter 92-01.

The Reference (a) letter required Commonwealth Edison (ComEd) to confirm commitment and applicability of the BWR Owners Group efforts to resolve reactor vessel structural issues, and to verify the information contained in an NRC database. ComEd provided the required information in Reference (b).

During the Reference (c) Teleconference, the NRC requested clarification of the information which was submitted in Reference (b). This was provided in Reference (d).

Upon further review of the information provided in Reference (d), ComEd identified two typographical errors in the information presented for Quad Cities Station. This letter transmits a correction of the typographical errors, including a correction of a typographical error in Enclosure 3 of Reference (d) (NEDO-32205-A; Equivalent Margin Analysis - Plant Applicability Verification Form - Quad Cities Station). A replacement for Enclosure 3 of Reference (d) is included as an Enclosure to this letter.

k:\ml\resd\l\py3.wpf\1

9501310463 950125
PDR ADOCK 05000254
P PDR

A028
1/1

Low Upper Shelf Energy (LUSE)

The applicability of topical report NEDO-32205-A, Revision 1 has been confirmed for Quad Cities Units 1 and 2.

Quad Cities Units 1 and 2

Near-core material surveillance data for Quad Cities Units 1 and 2 were evaluated as specified in Appendix B of the NEDO Report. The Appendix H capsule data shown in Table 13 of Reference (e) (also provided as Enclosure 1 in Reference (d)) were excluded from this evaluation because the fluence values are below the range of Regulatory Guide 1.99 Rev. 2, Figure 2. Ten of the surveillance data shown in Table 14 of Reference (e) (also provided as Enclosure 2 in Reference (d)) show a decrease in USE less than predicted in Regulatory Guide 1.99 Rev. 2, and the equivalent margin of the NEDO Report is bounding for the plant. For the two Quad Cities Unit 2 submerged arc weld surveillance data points which show a decrease in USE greater than predicted in Regulatory Guide 1.99 Rev. 2, the plant applicability verification of Appendix B of the NEDO Report was performed, and the results show that the equivalent margin analysis is still bounding for the plant. This information is provided in the Enclosure to this letter.

To the best of my knowledge and belief, the information contained herein is true and correct. In some respect, this information is not based on my personal knowledge, but upon information furnished by other Commonwealth Edison and contractor employees. Such information has been reviewed in accordance with company practice, and I believe it to be reliable.

We trust that the information is satisfactory; however, should you have any questions, or desire any additional information on this issue, please do not hesitate to contact this office.



Mary Jo Yack 1-25-95
Enclosure

Respectfully,

John L. Schrage
John L. Schrage
Nuclear Licensing Administrator

cc: J.B. Martin, Regional Administrator - RIII
R. Pulsifer, Project Manager - NRR
C. Miller, Senior Resident Inspector - Quad Cities
Office of Nuclear Facility Safety - IDNS

ENCLOSURE

Equivalent Margin Analysis

Plant Applicability Verification Form

Quad Cities Station