



# Commonwealth Edison Company

ONE FIRST NATIONAL PLAZA ★ CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Address Reply to:

POST OFFICE BOX 767 ★ CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60690

November 17, 1972

Mr. Angelo Giambusso  
Deputy Director of Reactor Projects  
Directorate of Licensing  
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20545

*Not  
as intended*



Subject: Vacuum Breaker Interim Surveillance  
Program for Quad-Cities, Units 1 & 2,  
AEC Dkts 50-254 and 50-265

Dear Mr. Giambusso:

*in file*  
The purpose of this letter is to acknowledge and comment on your November 8, 1972 letter regarding the Quad-Cities 1 and 2 vacuum breaker valves. We concur with the intent and objectives outlined in the letter. However, we believe that we have established a program that will meet these objectives better than the program outlined in your letter.

Valve position alarms are currently installed in the control room for both Units 1 and 2. The Unit 2 alarm will detect a 1/16" movement of the valve disc. The Unit 1 alarms will not detect such a small movement because, as you stated, the improved position switches have not yet been installed.

To compensate for the lack of having the improved position switches, the following approach is being used to assure proper vacuum breaker position.

We are operating the Unit 1 drywell at a slight positive pressure (.15 to .25 psi) with respect to the suppression chamber. The pressure differential can be

8305120248 721117  
PDR ADDCK 05000254  
S PDR

COPY SENT REGION *III*

6425

Commonwealth Edison Company

Mr. Angelo Giambusso

- 2 -

November 17, 1972

determined by indicators in the control room, and in addition, N<sub>2</sub> makeup is recorded in the control room. In effect we are continually monitoring the pressure decay to the limits described in 3.7.A.4.6 and 4.7.A.4.6 of our proposed technical specification for these valves as discussed in Special Report No. 4. By operating in this manner, we have continual knowledge of vacuum breaker position on Unit 1 and can detect the equivalent of a 1/16" opening on one valve. Differential pressure, total containment pressure and N<sub>2</sub> makeup are being logged twice per shift.

In addition, a monthly exercising test is being conducted. Since the Unit 1 valves have the arm modification to provide the additional closing force, we believe a monthly test is sufficient, and the weekly test suggested in Item 1 of your letter seems unnecessary.

With respect to the next to last paragraph of your letter, we had been logging the position of the vacuum breaker valves of both units daily at the local panel. Since the position of the valves on Unit 2 is known in the control room from the alarms, a requirement to log position at the local panel six times a day just because the alarm does not yet meet IEEE 279 standards seems unnecessary. Moreover, on Unit 1, since valve position is known from the pressure and makeup instrumentation, a daily logging at the local panel also appears adequate.

As directed, we are presently logging vacuum breaker position at the local panels twice per shift, and unless otherwise directed we will begin logging these positions daily starting on December 1, 1972. We are also currently following the surveillance procedures outlined herein, in lieu of your suggested methods, and will continue to do so.

Very truly yours,

*Byron Lee Jr.*

Byron Lee, Jr.  
Assistant to the President