

MAR 9 - 1988

Docket No. 50-344

Portland General Electric Company  
121 S. W. Salmon Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204

Attention: Mr. David W. Cockfield  
Vice President, Nuclear

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
TROJAN RESPONSE TO IEB 85-03

Portland General Electric Company's letters of May 8 and July 15, 1986, and November 18, 1987, pertaining to Trojan, contained their response to IEB 85-03, "Motor-Operated Valve Common Mode Failures During Plant Transients Due to Improper Switch Settings." The review of the responses indicates the need for additional information before the program to assure valve operability can be approved.

The specific information necessary for the completion of our review is enclosed.

Further, we request that you submit the additional information within one month of the date of this letter.

Sincerely,

*Original Signed*  
Dennis F. Kirsch, Director  
Division of Reactor Safety and  
Projects

Enclosure:  
As stated.

cc w/enclosure:  
C. A. Olmstead, Trojan Nuclear Plant  
J. W. Durham, PGE  
W. Dixon, DOE

MAR 9 - 1988

-2-

bcc w/enclosure:

RSB/Document Control Desk (RIDS) (IE01)

T. Chan, NRR

R. J. Kiessel, NRR

D. Persinko, NRR

M. Mendonca, RV

Project Inspector

Resident Inspector

G. Cook

B. Faulkenberry

J. Martin

Docket File

Bulletin File: IEB 85-03, RV

bcc w/o enclosure:

LFMB

M. Smith

Region V

REQUEST COPY	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> YES	<input type="radio"/> NO
SEND TO PDR	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> YES	<input type="radio"/> NO

DFKirsch/norma

3/9 /88

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI) RE:

Review of Responses to Action Item e of IE Bulletin 85-03

Licensee:  
Portland General Electric Co.  
121 S. W. Salmon Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204

Unit(s): Trojan  
Date of Response: 05-08-86  
07-15-86  
11-18-87

Respondent:  
David W. Cockfield  
Vice President, Nuclear

The information provided in your response to Action Item e of IE Bulletin 85-03 was found to be deficient in some areas. Provide the additional information necessary to resolve the following comments and questions:

1. Has water hammer due to valve closure been considered in the determination of pressure differentials? If not, explain.
2. If MOVATS is planned for application to some MOVs which are not included in its data base, commit to and describe an alternate method for determining the extra thrust necessary to overcome pressure differentials for these valves.
3. The proposed program for action items b, c and d of the bulletin is incomplete. Provide the following details as a minimum:
  - (a) commitment to a training program for setting switches, maintaining valve operators, using signature testing equipment and interpreting signatures, and
  - (b) commitment to justify continued operation of a valve determined to be inoperable.