

September 7, 2000

Mr. James Davis, Director
Operations Department
Nuclear Energy Institute
1776 I Street, N. W.
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006-3708

SUBJECT: PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO TSTF-337, "WOG STS 3.5.5 SEAL INJECTION FLOW"

Dear Mr. Davis:

This is to inform you that the staff has completed its review of TSTF-337 in which the NEI Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) proposed changes to the Standard Technical Specification (STS) requirements.

The Westinghouse Owner's Group (WOG) proposes to change TS 3.5.5 LCO to "Reactor coolant pump seal injection flow resistance shall be within limits." WOG further defines RCP seal flow resistance limits in the Bases section of Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.5.5.1. The three acceptance criteria for flow resistance limits proposed by the WOG are:

1. The flow resistance shall restrict a maximum seal injection flow to 40 gpm for the plant conditions with the reactor coolant system (RCS) at normal operating pressure, a minimum charging pump discharge header pressure of 2480 psig and the charging flow control valve at the full-open position.
2. The flow resistance shall limit seal injection flow and differential pressure within the acceptable region of Figure B 3.5.5-1.
3. The flow resistance shall be greater than 0.2117 ft/gpm^2 .

Further, the WOG states that the acceptance criteria for flow resistance limits discussed in items 1 through 3 above are established to ensure that the limits are sufficient for RCP seal integrity but limited so that the ECCS trains are capable of delivering sufficient water to match boiloff rates soon enough to minimize uncovering of the core following a large LOCA. Since we find that the WOG's acceptance criteria for the flow resistance limits meet the intent of the current STS 3.5.5, we conclude that acceptance criteria for the proposed flow resistance limits would provide the same level of protection as the current STS 3.5.5 with respect to ECCS performance, and are acceptable. However, the specific values of the seal flow resistance limits are different for each plant and are subject to the staff review and approval for plant specific licensing applications.

Additionally, we find that the WOG's approach to relocate the specific values of seal flow resistance limits from the LCO to the Bases section is not acceptable. As stated in WOG STS B 3.5.5, RCP seal flow limits have been identified as important parameters that affect the initial condition (including ECCS flow) of design basis accidents (such as an LOCA). In accordance with the 10 CFR 50.36(c)(2)(ii)(B) requirements, an LCO of RCP seal flow shall be established in the TS. 10 CFR 50.36(a) further states that "... A summary statement of the Bases or reasons for such specifications... shall not become part of the technical specifications." The WOG has proposed to use the sentence "Reactor coolant pump seal injection flow resistance shall be within limits" in STS LCO 3.5.5, and proposed to further define the "flow resistance limits" in the Bases section of TS SR 3.5.5.1 for completion of the LCO. Since the Bases, according to 10 CFR 50.36(a), are not part of the TS, the proposed TS 3.5.5 is not a complete TS. To satisfy the requirements of 10 CFR 50.36(c)(2)(ii)(B), the WOG should propose a complete LCO for RCP seal injection flow in TS 3.5.5 without relying on a definition of "flow resistance limits" in the Bases section of the TS. An STS may be acceptable if one or more of the acceptance criteria discussed in items 1 through 3 above are included in the proposed LCO, and ACTION and SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENT items are corrected to be consistent with the corresponding acceptance criteria. In addition, if a figure is used to define the acceptance criteria for the LCO, that figure must be included in the LCO itself.

We would be happy to meet with you at your earliest convenience to discuss our proposed changes. Please contact me at (301) 415-1161 or e-mail wdb@nrc.gov if you have any questions or need further information.

Sincerely,

/RA/

William D. Beckner, Chief
Technical Specifications Branch
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: See attached list
J. Arbuckle, BWROG
T. Weber, CEOG
N. Clarkson, BWOOG
S. Wideman, WOG
D. Hoffman, EXCEL
V. Gilbert, NEI

Additionally, we find that the WOG’s approach to relocate the specific values of seal flow resistance limits from the LCO to the Bases section is not acceptable. As stated in WOG STS B 3.5.5, RCP seal flow limits have been identified as important parameters that affect the initial condition (including ECCS flow) of design basis accidents (such as an LOCA). In accordance with the 10 CFR 50.36(c)(2)(ii)(B) requirements, an LCO of RCP seal flow shall be established in the TS. 10 CFR 50.36(a) further states that “... A summary statement of the Bases or reasons for such specifications... shall not become part of the technical specifications.” The WOG has proposed to use the sentence “Reactor coolant pump seal injection flow resistance shall be within limits” in STS LCO 3.5.5, and proposed to further define the “flow resistance limits” in the Bases section of TS SR 3.5.5.1 for completion of the LCO. Since the Bases, according to 10 CFR 50.36(a), are not part of the TS, the proposed TS 3.5.5 is not a complete TS. To satisfy the requirements of 10 CFR 50.36(c)(2)(ii)(B), the WOG should propose a complete LCO for RCP seal injection flow in TS 3.5.5 without relying on a definition of “flow resistance limits” in the Bases section of the TS. An STS may be acceptable if one or more of the acceptance criteria discussed in items 1 through 3 above are included in the proposed LCO, and ACTION and SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENT items are corrected to be consistent with the corresponding acceptance criteria. In addition, if a figure is used to define the acceptance criteria for the LCO, that figure must be included in the LCO itself.

We would be happy to meet with you at your earliest convenience to discuss our proposed changes. Please contact me at (301) 415-1161 or e-mail wdb@nrc.gov if you have any questions or need further information.

Sincerely,

/RA/

William D. Beckner, Chief
 Technical Specifications Branch
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: See attached list
 J. Arbuckle, BWROG
 T. Weber, CEOG
 N. Clarkson, BWOOG
 S. Wideman, WOG
 D. Hoffman, EXCEL
 V. Gilbert, NEI

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC DMatthews CEader WDBeckner TSTF-337
 RLDennig NGilles RTSB R/F ADAMS

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\tstf-337 transmittal letter.wpd

OFFICE	RTSB/DRIP:NRR	SC:RTSB/DRIP:NRR	C:RTSB:DRIP:NRR
NAME	Ngilles NVG	RLDennig RLD	WDBeckner WDB
DATE	09/7/00	09/7/00	09/7/00

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

cc: Mr. Ralph Beedle
Senior Vice President
and Chief Nuclear Officer
Nuclear Energy Institute
Suite 400
1776 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-3708

Ms. Lynnette Hendricks, Director
Plant Support
Nuclear Energy Institute
Suite 400
1776 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-3708

Mr. Alex Marion, Director
Programs
Nuclear Energy Institute
Suite 400
1776 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-3708

Mr. Charles B. Brinkman, Director
Washington Operations
ABB-Combustion Engineering, Inc.
12300 Twinbrook Parkway, Suite 330
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Mr. David Modeen, Director
Engineering
Nuclear Energy Institute
Suite 400
1776 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-3708

Mr. Anthony Pietrangelo, Director
Licensing
Nuclear Energy Institute
Suite 400
1776 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-3708

Mr. Hank Sepp, Manager
Regulatory and Licensing Engineering
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
P.O. Box 355
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230