

AUG 22 1985

Docket Nos. 50-373/374

Mr. Dennis L. Farrar  
Director of Licensing  
Post Office Box 767  
Chicago, Illinois 60690

Dear Mr. Farrar:

SUBJECT: SAFETY EVALUATION OF LA SALLE COUNTY STATION, UNITS 1 & 2,  
GENERIC LETTER 83-28 ITEMS 3.1.3 AND 3.2.3

By letter dated November 5, 1983, you responded to Generic Letter 83-28 with regard to required actions based on generic implications of Salem ATWS events for La Salle County Station, Units 1 and 2. The enclosed Safety Evaluation was prepared as a result of completing our review on certain applicable portions of your response to Generic Letter 83-28.

Based on our review, we conclude that your 3.1.3, "Post Maintenance Testing (Reactor Trip System Components)" and 3.2.3, "Post-Maintenance Testing (All other Safety-Related Components)" for La Salle County Station, Units 1 and 2, are acceptable. This completes our action on the subject issues.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

Walter R. Butler, Chief  
Licensing Branch No. 2  
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:  
As stated

cc w/enclosure:  
See next page

DISTRIBUTION:	Docket File	NRC PDR	Local PDR	PRC System	NSIC
LB#2 Peading	EHylton	ABournia	Woodhead, OELD	ACRS (16)	JPartlow
BGrimes	EJordan	LKintner	JHopkins		

LB  
LB#2/DL/PM  
ABournia:lb  
08/21/85

LB  
LB#2/DL/BC  
WButler  
08/21/85

8508300547 850822  
PDR ADOCK 05000373  
P PDR



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

AUG 22 1985

Docket Nos. 50-373/374

Mr. Dennis L. Farrar  
Director of Licensing  
Post Office Box 767  
Chicago, Illinois 60690

Dear Mr. Farrar:

SUBJECT: SAFETY EVALUATION OF LA SALLE COUNTY STATION, UNITS 1 & 2,  
GENERIC LETTER 83-28 ITEMS 3.1.3 AND 3.2.3

By letter dated November 5, 1983, you responded to Generic Letter 83-28 with regard to required actions based on generic implications of Salem ATWS events for La Salle County Station, Units 1 and 2. The enclosed Safety Evaluation was prepared as a result of completing our review on certain applicable portions of your response to Generic Letter 83-28.

Based on our review, we conclude that your 3.1.3, "Post Maintenance Testing (Reactor Trip System Components)" and 3.2.3, "Post-Maintenance Testing (All other Safety-Related Components)" for La Salle County Station, Units 1 and 2, are acceptable. This completes our action on the subject issues.

Sincerely,

*Walter R. Butler*

Walter R. Butler, Chief  
Licensing Branch No. 2  
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:  
As stated

cc w/enclosure:  
See next page

Mr. Dennis L. Farrar  
Commonwealth Edison Company

La Salle County Nuclear Power Station  
Units 1 & 2

cc:  
Philip P. Steptoe, Esquire  
Suite 4200  
One First National Plaza  
Chicago, Illinois 60603

John W. McCaffrey  
Chief, Public Utilities Division  
160 North La Salle Street, Room 900  
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Assistant Attorney General  
188 West Randolph Street  
Suite 2315  
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Resident Inspector/LaSalle, NPS  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Rural Route No. 1  
Post Office Box 224  
Marseilles, Illinois 61341

Chairman  
La Salle County Board of Supervisors  
La Salle County Courthouse  
Ottawa, Illinois 61350

Attorney General  
500 South 2nd Street  
Springfield, Illinois 62701

Chairman  
Illinois Commerce Commission  
Leland Building  
527 East Capitol Avenue  
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Mr. Gary N. Wright, Manager  
Nuclear Facility Safety  
Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety  
1035 Outer Park Drive, 5th Floor  
Springfield, Illinois 62704

Regional Administrator, Region III  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
799 Roosevelt Road  
Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137

CONFORMANCE TO GENERIC LETTER 83-28  
ITEMS 3.1.3 AND 3.2.3  
DRESDEN UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3, MILLSTONE UNIT NO. 1  
MONTICELLO, PILGRIM, QUAD CITIES UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2

R. VanderBeek

Published June 1985

EG&G Idaho, Inc.  
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83415

Prepared for the  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555  
Under DOE Contract No. DE-AC07-76ID01570  
FIN No. D60C1

#8548264269

11 pp

## ABSTRACT

This EG&G Idaho, Inc. report provides a review of the submittals for several nuclear plants for conformance to Generic Letter 83-28, items 3.1.3 and 3.2.3. The specific plants reviewed were selected as a group because of similarity in type and applicability of the review items. The group includes the following plants:

<u>Plant</u>	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>TAC Numbers</u>
Dresden 2	50-237	52995, 53833
Dresden 3	50-249	52996, 53834
Millstone 1	50-245	53016, 53855
Monticello	50-263	53018, 53857
Pilgrim	50-293	53029, 53868
Quad Cities 1	50-254	53034, 53873
Quad Cities 2	50-265	53035, 53874

## FOREWORD

This report is supplied as part of the program for evaluating licensee/applicant conformance to Generic Letter 83-28 "Required Actions based on Generic Implications of Salem ATWS Events." This work is conducted for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Division of System Integration by EG&G Idaho, Inc., NRC Licensing Support Section.

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission funded the work under the authorization, B&R 20-19-19-11-3, FIN No. D6001.

## CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	i
FOREWORD .....	i
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
2. REVIEW REQUIREMENTS .....	2
3. GROUP REVIEW RESULTS .....	2
4. REVIEW RESULTS FOR DRESDEN UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3 .....	5
4.1 Evaluation .....	5
4.2 Conclusion .....	5
5. REVIEW RESULTS FOR MILLSTONE 1 .....	6
5.1 Evaluation .....	6
5.2 Conclusion .....	6
6. REVIEW RESULTS FOR MONTICELLO .....	7
6.1 Evaluation .....	7
6.2 Conclusion .....	7
7. REVIEW RESULTS FOR PILGRIM .....	8
7.1 Evaluation .....	8
7.2 Conclusion .....	8
8. REVIEW RESULTS FOR QUAD CITIES UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2 .....	9
8.1 Evaluation .....	9
8.2 Conclusion .....	9
9. GROUP CONCLUSION .....	10
10. REFERENCES .....	11

## TABLES

1. Table 1 .....	4
------------------	---

CONFORMANCE TO GENERIC LETTER 83-28

ITEMS 3.1.3 AND 3.2.3

DRESDEN UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3, MILLSTONE UNIT NO. 1  
MONTICELLO, PILGRIM, QUAD CITIES UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2

1. INTRODUCTION

On July 8, 1983, Generic Letter No. 83-28<sup>1</sup> was issued by D. G. Eisenhut, Director of the Division of Licensing, Nuclear Reactor Regulation, to all licensees of operating reactors, applicants for operating licenses, and holders of construction permits. This letter included required actions based on generic implications of the Salem ATWS events. These requirements have been published in Volume 2 of NUREG-1000, "Generic Implications of ATWS Events at the Salem Nuclear Power Plant".<sup>2</sup>

This report documents the EG&G Idaho, Inc. review of the submittals from Dresden Units Nos. 2 and 3, Millstone Unit No. 1, Monticello, Pilgrim, and Quad Cities Unit Nos. 1 and 2 for conformance to items 3.1.3 and 3.2.3 of Generic Letter 83-28. The submittals from the licensees utilized in these evaluations are referenced in section 10 of this report.

These review results are applicable to the group of nuclear plants previously identified because of their similarity. These plants are similar in the following respects.

1. They are operating GE-BWR reactors
2. They utilize the MARK 1 Containment and Pressure Suppression Systems
3. They are 1965 and 1966 (Model 3) reactors
4. They utilize two class 1E Power System Trains
5. They use relay logic in the Reactor Trip Systems.

An item of concern identified for any one of these plants is assumed to be potentially significant for all of the plants in the group.



## 2. REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

Item 3.1.3 (Post-Maintenance Testing of Reactor Trip System Components) requires licensees and applicants to identify, if applicable, any post-maintenance test requirements for the Reactor Trip System (RTS) in existing technical specifications which can be demonstrated to degrade rather than enhance safety. Item 3.2.3 extends this same requirement to include all other safety-related components. Any proposed technical specification changes resulting from this action shall receive a pre-implementation review by NRC.

## 3. GROUP REVIEW RESULTS

The relevant submittals from each of the named reactor plants were reviewed to determine compliance with items 3.1.3 and 3.2.3 of the Generic Letter. First, the submittals from each plant were reviewed to determine that these two items were specifically addressed. Second, the submittals were checked to determine if there were any post-maintenance test items specified by the technical specifications that were suspected to degrade rather than enhance safety. Last, the submittals were reviewed for evidence of special conditions or other significant information relating to the two items of concern. The results of this review are summarized for each plant in Table 1.

With the exception of the response for the Pilgrim Station, all of the responses indicated that there had been no items identified from the licensees review of the technical specifications relating to post-maintenance testing that could be demonstrated to degrade rather than enhance safety. However, the licensees gave no insight on the depth of review conducted on these two items.

The response for Monticello indicated that the licensee had based his evaluation on an incomplete review of the technical specification requirements and is taking the position that no further review or action is required for the two items since the partial reviews had identified no



post-maintenance testing requirements that degrade rather than enhance safety of the reactor trip system or other safety-related components.

The licensee's response for Pilgrim Station did not address the central issue of items 3.1.3 and 3.2.3, i.e., to identify any post-maintenance test requirements in existing technical specifications which can be demonstrated to degrade rather than enhance safety of the reactor trip system and other safety related components.

The BWR Owners Group is presently addressing Generic Letter 83-28 item 4.5.3<sup>3</sup> which may result in proposed changes to the technical specification requirements for surveillance testing frequency and out-of-service intervals for testing and post-maintenance testing. The primary concern of item 4.5.3 is the surveillance testing intervals. Items 3.1.3 and 3.2.3 are specifically directed at post-maintenance test requirements. These concerns are essentially independent. However, the evaluations of these concerns are coordinated so that any correlation between these concerns will be adequately considered. Since no specific proposal to change the technical specifications has been proposed, there is no identifiable need at this time for correlating the reviews of item 4.5.3 with this review.

TABLE 1.

<u>Plants</u>	<u>Were Items 3.1.3 and 3.2.3 Addressed in the Submittal</u>	<u>Licensee Findings</u>	<u>Responses Acceptable</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Dresden 2 and 3	Yes	No tech. spec. items identified that degrade safety	Yes	--
Millstone 1	Yes	No tech. spec. items identified that degrade safety	Yes	--
Monticello	Yes	--	No	Reviews not complete, however, licensee's position is that no further action would be required.
Pilgrim	Yes	--	No	The licensee has not provided an evaluation response.
Quad Cities 1 and 2	Yes	No tech. spec. items identified that degrade safety	Yes	--

#### 4. REVIEW RESULTS FOR DRESDEN UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3

##### 4.1 Evaluation

Commonwealth Edison, the licensee for Dresden Station Unit Nos. 2 and 3, provided responses to items 3.1.3 and 3.2.3 of Generic Letter 83-28 on November 5, 1983.<sup>4</sup> Within the responses, the licensee's evaluation for items 3.1.3 and 3.2.3 is that, following a review of the technical specifications, there were no post-maintenance test requirements identified for the reactor trip system or other safety-related components which tended to degrade rather than enhance plant safety.

##### 4.2 Conclusion

Based on the licensee's statement that they have reviewed their technical specification requirements to identify any post maintenance testing which could be demonstrated to degrade rather than enhance safety and found none that degraded safety, we find the licensee's responses acceptable.

## 8. REVIEW RESULTS FOR QUAD CITIES UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2

### 8.1 Evaluation

Commonwealth Edison, licensee for the Quad Cities Station Unit Nos. 1 and 2, provided responses to items 3.1.3 and 3.2.3 of Generic Letter 83-28 on November 5, 1983.<sup>4</sup> Within the responses, the licensee's evaluation for items 3.1.3 and 3.2.3 is that, following a review of the technical specifications, there were no post-maintenance test requirements identified for the reactor trip system or other safety-related components which tended to degrade rather than enhance plant safety.

### 8.2 Conclusion

Based on the licensee's statement that they have reviewed their technical specification requirements to identify any post maintenance testing which could be demonstrated to degrade rather than enhance safety and found none that degraded safety, we find the licensee's responses acceptable.

## 9. GROUP CONCLUSION

With the exception of the responses for Pilgrim Station and Monticello, the staff concludes that the licensees' responses for items 3.1.3 and 3.2.3 of Generic Letter 83-28 are adequate and acceptable.

## 10. REFERENCES

1. NRC Letter, D. G. Eisenhut to all Licensees of Operating Reactors, Applicants for Operating License, and Holders of Construction Permits, "Required Actions Based on Generic Implications of Salem ATWS Events (Generic Letter 83-28)", July 8, 1983.
2. Generic Implications of ATWS Events at the Salem Nuclear Power Plant, NUREG-1000, Volume 1, April 1983; Volume 2, July 1983.
3. BWR Owners' Group Responses to NRC Generic Letter 83-28, Item 4.5.3, General Electric Company Proprietary Information, NEDC-30844, January 1985.
4. Commonwealth Edison letter to NRC, P. L. Barnes to H. R. Denton, Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, NRC, "Dresden Station Units 2 and 3, Quad Cities Station Units 1 and 2, Zion Station Units 1 and 2, LaSalle County Station Units 1 and 2, Byron Station Units 1 and 2, Braidwood Station Units 1 and 2, Response to Generic Letter No. 83-28, NRC Docket Nos. 50-237/249, 50-254/265, 50-295/304, 50-373/374, 50-454/455, and 50-456/457," November 5, 1983.
5. Northeast Utilities letter to NRC, W. G. Council to D. G. Eisenhut, Director, Division of Licensing, NRC, "Haddam Neck Plant, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Response to Generic Letter 83-28, Generic Implications of Salem ATWS Events," November 8, 1983.
6. Northern States Power Company letter to NRC, D. Musolf to Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, NRC, "Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Docket No. 50-263, License No. DPR-22, Generic Implications of Salem ATWS Events. (Generic Letter 83-28)", November 14, 1983.
7. Boston Edison Company letter to NRC, W. D. Harrington to D. B. Vassallo, Chief, Operating Reactors Branch No. 2, Division of Licensing, NRC, "Response to Generic Letter 83-28", November 7, 1983.