1-7
PDR

JAN 7 1969

Docket No. 50263

Those listed below

ASSIGNMENTS FOR THE POL REVIEW OF NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY'S MONTICELLO STATION

A proposed POL review plan for the Monticello station was discussed by RP and RT representatives at a meeting held on December 13, 1968. This meeting was attended by R. C. DeYoung, P. W. Howe, V. A. Moore, A. W. Dromerick, M. Rosen, D. B. Vassallo, and D. R. Muller acting for R. S. Boyd. The review plan and assignments agreed to at this meeting are presented in Table I. The review schedule is presented in Table II. Procedural and background notes applicable to this review are also attached.

The responsibility for this project has been assigned to Reactor Project Branch No. 1. D. B. Vassallo has been assigned as lead reviewer and will be assisted by C. J. Hale.

Original Signed by
Peter A. Morris

/s/

Peter A. Morris, Director
Division of Reactor Licensing

Addressees:
D. J. Skovholt
S. Levine
R. S. Boyd
R. C. DeYoung
D. R. Muller
R. Tedesco
C. Long
R. E. Ireland
D. Knuth
D. B. Vassallo
C. J. Hale
Branch Chiefs, RO
Branch Chiefs, RT
RPB-1 Reading
H. L. Price
C. K. Beck
M. M. Mann
R. L. Doan

I. Spickler
L. Porse
S. S. Pawlicki
J. P. Knight
A. L. Gluckmann
T. A. Ippolito
O. J. Smith
H. Specter
C. W. Moon
A. Brauner
N. Blunt
Suppl.
RL Reading
DR Reading

H. L. Price
C. K. Beck
M. M. Mann
R. L. Doan

OFFICE ▶	RL:RPB-1	RL:RPB-1	RL:RT	RL:RP	RL	RL
SURNAME ▶	Vassallo/eb	Muller	DeYoung	Boyd	Schroeder	Morris
DATE ▶	12/20/68	12/20/68	12/20/68	12/23/68	12/30/68	1/7/68

Form AEC-318 (Rev. 9-53)

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1966—O-214-629

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20545

January 7, 1969

Docket No. 50-263

Those listed below

ASSIGNMENTS FOR THE POL REVIEW OF NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY'S MONTICELLO STATION

A proposed POL review plan for the Monticello station was discussed by RP and RT representatives at a meeting held on December 13, 1968. This meeting was attended by R. C. DeYoung, P. W. Howe, V. A. Moore, A. W. Dromerick, M. Rosen, D. B. Vassallo, and D. R. Muller acting for R. S. Boyd. The review plan and assignments agreed to at this meeting are presented in Table I. The review schedule is presented in Table II. Procedural and background notes applicable to this review are also attached.

The responsibility for this project has been assigned to Reactor Project Branch No. 1. D. B. Vassallo has been assigned as lead reviewer and will be assisted by C. J. Hale.

Peter A. Morris

Peter A. Morris, Director
Division of Reactor Licensing

Addressees:

D. J. Skovholt
S. Levine
R. S. Boyd
R. C. DeYoung
D. R. Muller
R. Tedesco
C. Long
R. E. Ireland
D. Knuth
D. B. Vassallo
C. J. Hale
Branch Chiefs, RO
Branch Chiefs, RT
RPB-1 Reading
H. L. Price
C. K. Beck
M. M. Mann
R. L. Doan
I. Spickler
L. Porse
S. S. Pawlicki
J. P. Knight
A. L. Gluckmann
T. A. Ippolito
O. J. Smith
H. Specter
C. W. Moon
A. Brauner
N. Blunt
Suppl.
RL Reading
DR Reading

MONTICELLO UNIT 1

BACKGROUND AND REVIEW PLAN PROCEDURES

In Amendment No. 9, NSP formally applied for an operating license at the "stretch" power level of 1670 Mw thermal (545.4 Mwe). For the construction permit review, the core thermal and hydraulic characteristics were evaluated at a power level of 1469 Mw thermal.

Monticello is in the low power density class of GE reactors and is most similar to Quad-Cities 1 and 2, and Dresden 2 and 3. Most of the topics which will be considered in the Monticello POL review are being, or have been, subjected to in-depth reviews in connection with the above mentioned plants. Therefore, with the exception of site related items, the detailed review plan for Quad-Cities 1 and 2, which delineates in detail the responsibilities of RP, RT, and RO, will be followed for the Monticello review and is not repeated in this memorandum. Table I highlights the major areas where assistance will be received from RT and RO. Each reviewer should use to the fullest extent possible the results and decisions of the past reviews for identical systems and features. However, a reviewer should ascertain, from the applicant if need be, that systems and analyses are identical and applicable to Monticello.

Each reviewer should: a) identify potential safety problems and provide suggested questions for additional information, b) participate in technical meetings, c) write a report including scope of review, conclusions, and d) comment on applicable items in the Technical Specifications.

TABLE I

TOPICS ASSIGNED TO REACTOR TECHNOLOGY AND REACTOR OPERATIONS

A. TOPICS ASSIGNED TO RT

1.0 SITE AND DOSE EVALUATION (I. Spickler)

1.1 Review the results of onsite meteorological data and compare with previously used data in PSAR. Evaluate ESSA meteorology report. Develop routine gaseous release rate limits for site.

1.2 Review the environmental monitoring program as related to Fish and Wildlife recommendations.

1.3 Calculate potential doses from accidents including loss of coolant, control rod drop, refueling accident, steam line break, and coolant line break in the reactor building.

1.4 Evaluate acceptability of using 1000-year flood in determining flood stage in light of current requirements for using the maximum probable flood. Include effects of upstream dams.

1.5 Evaluate possible airborne radiological effects of cooling tower usage including effect on micro-meteorology (see 50-277/278 Peach Bottom Units 2 and 3, Amendment 3, p. 4 and Amendment 4, pp. 1 and 3).

1.6 Determine if there are any special restrictions on liquid rad-waste discharge for low river flow conditions when cooling towers will operate on a closed or partially closed cycle (See Section 9.2.0 and Section 11.6.0 of the Monticello FSAR, also Question 3.5 in Amendment 4 to the Monticello PSAR).

2.0 REACTOR VESSEL AND CLASS I MECHANICAL SYSTEMS

2.1 Review field fabricated reactor vessel with respect to code certification, blowdown forces, quality assurance, and provisions for in-service inspection. Evaluate extent of compliance with "Tentative Regulatory Supplementary Criteria for ASME Code-Constructed Nuclear Pressure Vessels." (L. Porse)

2.2 Review details of seismic design for reactor internals and Class I mechanical systems. Coordinate comments of Newmark and Hall in this area. (S. S. Pawlicki)

2.3 Evaluate extent of compliance with Criterion 35. (S. S. Pawlicki)

2.4 Evaluate potential for flow induced vibration of reactor internals. (J. P. Knight)

3.0 CONTAINMENT AND OTHER CLASS I STRUCTURES

3.1 Determine the adequacy of the structural design of all Class I structures identified in Section 12.2 of the FSAR. (A. L. Gluckmann)

3.2 Evaluate the tornado design of the reactor building. (A. L. Gluckmann)

4.0 INSTRUMENTATION, CONTROL, AND ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS

4.1 Perform a standard POL evaluation of the instrumentation, control and electrical systems. (T. A. Ippolito)

4.2 Evaluate the adequacy of the seismic design of d.c. battery racks. (Coordinate with Newmark-Hall)

5.0 ENGINEERED SAFETY FEATURES AND EMERGENCY SYSTEMS

5.1 Review the adequacy of the experimental and analytical tests to confirm integrated performance of ECCS at high fuel clad temperatures. (O. J. Smith)

5.2 Evaluate the adequacy of GE's revised model for the analysis of loss of coolant accidents. (O. J. Smith)

5.3 Evaluate containment design bases. (H. Specter)

5.4 Evaluate problem of post-accident radiolytic hydrogen production. (M. Rosen)

5.5 Establish functional performance requirements of standby liquid control system. (C. W. Moon)

6.0 TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

6.1 Provide assistance and input where required.

B. TOPICS ASSIGNED TO RO (A. Brauner)

1.0 Evaluate conduct of operations, including:

a. Organization

b. Operating procedures

c. Emergency plans and procedures

d. Records

e. Pre-operational and startup test programs

f. Periodic in-service inspection.

2.0 With regards to Technical Specifications, provide assistance and input where required.

TABLE II

REVIEW SCHEDULE

MONTICELLO, UNIT 1

ITEM	DATE
Type of review	POL
Application filed	11/7/68
Plant tour and initial meeting with applicant	11/19-20/68
Technical meeting - discussion of major problem areas	1/22/69
Written questions from RT and RO for additional information	3/21/69
Comments from consultants outlining principal concerns	3/21/69
Technical meeting with draft questions	3/27/69
Additional information request to applicant	4/11/69
Additional information received from applicant	6/1/69
Final reports required from consultants, RT and RO	8/1/69
Technical meeting including discussion of Technical Specifications	8/69
ACRS site visit	9/69
ACRS Report deadline	9/69
ACRS Subcommittee meeting	9/69
ACRS meeting	10/69
Safety Evaluation	11/69