



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

February 4, 1993

Mr. Paul G. Shewmon, Chairman
Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Shewmon:


SUBJECT: PROPOSED BRANCH TECHNICAL POSITION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALIFICATION OF
ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT FOR LICENSE RENEWAL

I am responding to the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards' (ACRS) October 22, 1992, letter. In that letter, the ACRS indicated that the proposed branch technical position (BTP) should not be issued for public comment until the matters discussed in the ACRS letter have been addressed. The following is the staff's response to the ACRS letter.

After the staff identified this issue for license renewal and presented the BTP to both the ACRS and the Committee to Review Generic Requirements (CRGR), the staff decided that environmental qualification (EQ) needs to be evaluated as an issue of potential safety concern for some operating plants. Therefore, the staff will address EQ as a current issue using the established regulatory process, not as part of the license renewal review. The staff will reassess the adequacy of EQ for plants whose current licensing basis (CLB) is either the DOR Guidelines or NUREG-0588, "Interim Staff Position On Environmental Qualification Of Safety-Related Electrical Equipment," Category II.

The staff will consider existing ACRS comments in this reassessment. Additionally, the staff will keep the ACRS informed of its progress on this issue.

Sincerely,


James M. Taylor
Executive Director
for Operations

cc:
The Chairman
Commissioner Rogers
Commissioner Curtiss
Commissioner Remick
Commissioner de Planque
SECY
Helen Pastis

RETURN TO REGULATORY CENTRAL FILES

9302120241 930204
PDR ORG NE ED
PDR

L-4-1, PT. 54
X RD-7-2-1
D031

DISTRIBUTION:

Central File
 EDO R/F
 JBlaha, EDO
 TMurley/FMiraglia, 12G18
 WRussell, 12G18
 EJordan, MNBB3701
 WTravers, 11H21
 OCA
 PShemanski, 11F23
 BToms, 11H21, GT8215
 VBolling, GT8215
 JCraig, NLS007

NRC PDR
 JTaylor, EDO
 HThompson, EDO
 EBeckjord, NLS007
 FGillespie, 12G18
 JScinto, OGC
 OGC
 NRR Mailroom w/incoming LLuther, 11F23
 P.T. Kuo, 11F23 PDLR R/F
 PMagnanelli, 11H21, GT8215
 LShao, NLS007
 EDO #8215
 JSniezek, EDO
 MTaylor, 17G21
 JPartlow, 12G18
 RBernero, 6E6
 Crutchfield, 11H21
 OPA
 MVagins, NLS217B

*See previous concurrence

PDLR:LA	PDLR:SEE	TECH ED*	PDLR:SC *	PDLR:D *
LLuther <i>ll</i>	PShemanski <i>PS</i>	JMain	PTKuo	SNewberry
1/28/93	1/28/93	1/27/93	1/28/93	1/28/93
SPLB:NRR <i>2</i>	DST:NRR <i>1</i>	ADT:NRR <i>1</i>	DADAR:NRR <i>1</i>	DADAR:NRR <i>1</i>
CMcCracken	ATHadani <i>1</i>	WRussell <i>1</i>	WTravers <i>1</i>	TMurley <i>1</i>
1/29/93	1/29/93	2/1/93	2/1/93	2/2/93
EDO <i>1</i>		#3211		
JTaylor				
2/4/93				

OFFICIAL DOCUMENT COPY: GT8215



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

Craig
ACTION

EDO Principal Correspondence Control

FROM:

DUE: 11/13/92

EDO CONTROL: 0008215
DOC DT: 10/22/92
FINAL REPLY:

DAVID A. WARD
ACRS

TO:

Received 10/26/92

TAYLOR

FOR SIGNATURE OF:

** GRN **

CRC NO:

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

DESC:

ROUTING:

PROPOSED BRANCH TECHNICAL POSITION ON
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALIFICATION OF ELECTRICAL
EQUIPMENT FOR LICENSE RENEWAL

TAYLOR
SNIEZEK
THOMPSON
BLAHA
MAT TAYLOR
BECKJORD, RES
BERNERO, NMSS
JORDAN, AEOD
SCINTO, OGC

DATE: 10/23/92

DESIGNED TO:

CONTACT:

NRR

MURLEY

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS:

PREPARE RESPONSE TO ACRS FOR EDO'S SIGNATURE.
PUT COMMISSIONERS AND SECY ON CC (SHOWN ON
ORIGINAL) FOR REPLY.

Frank

NRR Rec'd: 10/26/92

NRR Action: ADAR/Crotchfield

[Signature]

NRR Routing: Murley

Muraglia

Portlow

Gillespie

Crotchfield

Russell

Mad Roura

12618

ACTION	
DUE TO NRR DIRECTOR'S OFFICE	
BY	<i>11/10/92</i>



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

October 22, 1992

Mr. James M. Taylor
Executive Director for Operations
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Taylor:

SUBJECT: PROPOSED BRANCH TECHNICAL POSITION ON ENVIRONMENTAL
QUALIFICATION OF ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT FOR LICENSE
RENEWAL

During the 390th meeting of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, October 8-10, 1992, we reviewed a proposed Branch Technical Position (BTP) on Environmental Qualification of Electrical Equipment for License Renewal. Our Subcommittees on Plant License Renewal and Reliability and Quality reviewed this matter during a joint meeting on September 16, 1992. The staff proposes that the BTP be issued for public comment. During these meetings, we had the benefit of discussions with members of the NRC staff, its consultants, and representatives of industry. We also had the benefit of the documents referenced.

Under the License Renewal Rule, 10 CFR Part 54, applicants will be required to develop a comprehensive program to identify in their plants all structures, systems, and components (SSCs) which may be subject to age-related degradation unique to the license renewal period. A further program to manage these components to ensure continued safe operation of the plant is also required. The staff is now proposing an additional program, by means of a BTP, which singles out environmental qualification of electrical equipment for special treatment in the license renewal period. The particular concern of the staff seems to be that the qualification standards for insulation used on electrical cables prior to 1984 (representing 87 of 111 licensed nuclear power plant units) may not ensure adequate performance of cables for extended plant life. That, of course, is the issue for all SSCs in a plant, and it is not clear to us why the more general treatment of SSCs called for under 10 CFR Part 54 is not adequate for electrical cables as well.

Industry representatives expressed objection to the staff proposal for a BTP. They believe that while older plant cables were qualified to a lesser standard than has been in use since 1984, these cables have been approved for continued use in the plants (as

October 22, 1992

has much other equipment where standards have evolved) and are part of the Current Licensing Basis (CLB) for each of these plants. Their interpretation of 10 CFR Part 54 is that the CLB is to be preserved with the exception that those SSCs subject to age-related degradation unique to the license renewal period should be subjected to specific management programs. They see no need for the BTP and believe it will result in unnecessary cable replacements and add significantly to plant costs for license renewal.


We are not convinced that the proposed BTP has been shown to be necessary or appropriate. It should not be issued for public comment until the matters discussed below have been addressed.

Neither the staff nor the industry presented any risk perspective on this issue. In simple terms, the risk is as follows: During the license renewal period the electrical cable in a key system might degrade in a way that the degradation would remain undetected during normal operation and by normal maintenance, testing, and surveillance practices. Then, during an accident, i.e., a LOCA, the insulation would fail and the key system would not perform its design function to mitigate effects of the accident. Present licensing practice assumes, and experience seems to confirm, that the probability of this sequence during the initial license period is acceptably low. At issue is whether the probability during the license renewal period is significantly greater. No evidence has been presented either way. Analysis of the risk importance of this issue should be made before the BTP is finally accepted or rejected. Such an analysis should include estimates of downside risks inherent in major projects intended to improve nuclear power plant safety.

Many electrical cables are covered with fire retardant materials. These coatings could have important effects on the aging of the cable insulation. Apparently, these effects have not been considered by the staff in development of this BTP. We do not know whether they have yet been explicitly considered in the selection and evaluation of important SSCs in license renewal programs. They should be.

Dr. Thomas Kress did not participate in the Committee's deliberations regarding this matter.

Sincerely,



David A. Ward
Chairman

References:

1. Memorandum dated July 10, 1992, from John W. Craig, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, NRC, for Raymond F. Fraley, Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, Subject: Request for Review of Branch Technical Position on Environmental Qualification of Electrical Equipment for License Renewal, with enclosures
2. Letter dated October 7, 1992, from M. H. Philips, Jr., and W. A. Horin, Counsel to the Nuclear Utility Group on Equipment Qualification, to D. A. Ward, Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, Subject: NRC Staff Proposed License Renewal BTP Regarding Environmental Qualification of Electric Equipment, with enclosures