

JUN 11 1981

Dist.

~~Docket File~~

LB#1 Rdg
DEisenhut
BJYoungblood
JGrant
MRushbrook
RTedesco
RVoller
TMurley
RMattson
RMattson
WJohnston
OELD
OIE (3)

bcc:
TERA
NRC/PDR
L/PDR
NSIC
TIC
ACRS (16)

Docket No.: 50-423

Mr. W. G. Council
Vice President Nuclear Engineering
and Operations
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
Post Office Box 270
Hartford, Connecticut 06101

Dear Mr. Council:

Subject: Staff Evaluation of Item I.C.1 for Westinghouse Facilities

We have completed our interim review of the Westinghouse Owners Group submittal for Action Plan item I.C.1, Guidance for the Evaluation and Development of Procedures for Transients and Accidents. A copy of Mr. Eisenhut's May 28, 1981 letter to Mr. Jurgensen, Chairman, Westinghouse Owners Group is enclosed for your information. As indicated in the enclosure, further work will be necessary in order to produce a document which satisfies the staff positions in a timely matter.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:
B. J. Youngblood

B. J. Youngblood, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 1
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:
As stated

cc: See next page



REGULATORY DOCKET FILE COPY

* See previous yellow.

DL:LB#1 DL:LB#1

*JGrant/ys BJYoungblood
6/ /81 6/ /81

A 8106220254

Mr. W. G. Council

cc: Mr. John J. Korkosz, Manager
City of Chicopee Electric
Light Department
725 Front Street
Chicopee, Massachusetts 01014

Mr. James E. Tribble
Assistant to the President
New England Electric System
20 Turnpike Road
Westborough, Massachusetts 06508

Mr. Bruce R. Garlick
Manager, Energy Supply
Fitchburg Gas and Electric
Light Company
655 Main Street
Fitchburg, Massachusetts 01421

Mr. Wardman K. Brooksbank, Manager
Town of South Hadley Electric
Light Department
85 Main Street
South Hadley, Massachusetts 01075

Mr. Ralph H. Wood
General Counsel
Public Service Company of
New Hampshire
1000 Elm Street
Manchester, New Hampshire 03101

William H. Cuddy, Esq.
Day, Barry & Howard
One Constitution Plaza
Hartford, Connecticut 06103

John D. Fassett, Vice President
The United Illuminating Company
80 Temple Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06508

Mr. H. R. Nims, Manager
Nuclear Products
Northeast Utilities Service Company
P. O. Box 270
Hartford, Connecticut 06101

Mr. James R. Himmelwright
Northeast Utilities Service Company
P. O. Box 270
Hartford, Connecticut 06101

Resident Inspector/Millstone NPS
c/o U. S. NRC
P. O. Drawer KK
Niantic, Connecticut 06357

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

MAY 28 1981

Robert W. Jurgensen, Chairman
Westinghouse Owners Group
American Electric Power Service
Corporation
2 Broadway
New York, New York 10004

Dear Mr. Jurgensen:

In your letter dated March 18, 1981 (06-54), you summarized a meeting held on February 20, 1981 between representatives of the NRC staff, Westinghouse Owners, and Westinghouse Electric Corporation. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Westinghouse Owners Group (WOG) activities in response to NUREG-0737, Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements, Item I.C.1, Guidance for the Evaluation and Development of Procedures for Transients and Accidents. Following the meeting summary, you requested that the staff acknowledge the acceptability of the program described in the meeting.

As indicated in a meeting with Tom Anderson, of Westinghouse, on April 8, 1981, we have concerns about the acceptability of the WOG program. The last submittal of generic WOG guidelines, including the Inadequate Core Cooling Guidelines, required the operator to diagnose a specific event using the diagnostic procedure included in the guidelines. Subsequent failures were, essentially, addressed by entry into one of the inadequate core cooling guidelines. As indicated in the February meeting and discussed in your letter, the guidelines do not provide smooth transitions from the event procedures to direct the operator if subsequent multiple or consequential failures occur. This leaves the operator with no guidance until entry conditions for the Inadequate Core Cooling Guidelines are reached. Furthermore, the guidelines do not address subsequent reevaluation of plant conditions to ensure that the expected plant response is occurring.

Our second concern is your proposed schedule for completing the program recognizing that development of emergency operating procedures is a dynamic process with no absolute end point. However, we are concerned that continual, major rewriting of emergency operating procedures is a burden on plant operating staffs and confusing to the operators who must relearn the procedures. In the February meeting, WOG representatives indicated that they expect to have the initial development phase of the guidelines completed in July 1981, and would not expect major changes to the guidelines to result from the phases to be completed in January 1982 and July 1982. You also state in your letter that the initial phase will address over 98 percent of the total risk. However, we were also told in the meeting that the guidelines to be submitted in July would probably not differ greatly from those already submitted. Considering our concerns with the existing guidelines, as addressed above, we do not see how the July submittal can be responsive to NUREG-0737, Item I.C.1 without significant change. We believe that additional work is necessary.

*dup of
8106180374*


MAY 28 1981

The staff has not completed its review of WCAP 9691 or the probability estimates presented in the February meeting, and the Owners Group has not addressed the broad range of initiating events, including natural phenomena such as earthquakes, in the analysis presented to date. Therefore, we cannot assess the overall adequacy of the proposed program. Unless our concerns, as stated herein, are satisfied, the ability of licensees to meet the schedule for revising their procedures may be compromised.

As indicated in the April 8, 1981 meeting, we have serious doubts that the full range of initiating events and subsequent failures can be addressed within the event specific framework adopted by the Westinghouse Owners Group. If your additional work to date provides more insight into resolution of these concerns, we would be available to meet with you at your convenience.

By copy of this letter, each licensee and applicant of a Westinghouse-type plant, is being advised of our evaluation of your submittal.

Sincerely,


Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing

cc: E. Murphy
W Licensees
W Applicants