

## Record for Email and FAX from Fred Emerson, NEI on June 12, 2002

This is an email from Fred Emerson, of NEI, to Joseph Birmingham, NRC, June 12, 2002, with information requested as followup to a meeting on Manual Actions held on June 20, 2002. The FAX referred to in Item 1 below requested a document regarding a 3-28-83 meeting summary which discussed manual actions. The meeting summary in the FAX is included in this record.

>>>>>>>>>>>

Joe,

Here is the information we agreed to provide to NRC as a followup to the June 20 meeting on manual actions. call me if there are any questions.

Fred

[illegible]

Follow up items :

1. Slide 23 - provide NRC a copy of the 3/16/83 meeting summary

Will fax this - please provide a fax number.

2. Slide 27 - Did the interaction with the licensee involve NRR and the Regional Staff or only the Region?

NRR

3. Slide 31 - Was this an Appendix R or NUREG-0800 licensing basis for this plant?

NUREG-0800

4. Slide 35 - What form (verbal or written) of NRC guidance on the acceptability of manual actions in 1983 meeting??

Verbal, captured in the licensee's written meeting summary .

Letter from NEI providing a followup to our request at the June 20, 2002 meeting for a copy of a 1983 letter regarding manual actions.

NUCLEAR UTILITY FIRE  
PROTECTION GROUP

SLITE 700  
1200 SEVENTEENTH STREET, N. W.  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036  
(202) 857-9633

March 28, 1983

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Nuclear Fire Protection Group

From: J. Michael McGarry  
Malcolm H. Philips

Subj: Summary of March 16, 1983 Group Meeting

On March 16, 1983, the Fire Protection Group ("Group") met at the offices of Debevoise & Liberman in Washington, D.C. for the purposes of (1) reviewing the status of the Appendix R exemption request appeal process, (2) exchanging experiences regarding the appeal process, (3) discussing the pending Appendix R I&E inspection process, and (4) as appropriate, charting direction of Group activities. A list of attendees is attached hereto (Attachment A). Representatives from I&E attended a portion of the meeting and responded to questions from Group members regarding topics of interest. Due to the length of these discussions, the remaining agenda items were discussed only briefly. A summary of discussions involving the NRC representatives, and discussions of Group members regarding items on the meeting agenda are as follows:

I. GROUP DISCUSSIONS WITH I&E

The three members of the I&E staff present during the meeting were (1) Jim Taylor (Director, Division of Quality Assurance, Safeguards & Inspection Programs); (2) Jim Stone (Chief of Construction Programs/Construction Appraisal Team); and (3) Leon Whitney, Assistant to Taylor responsible for coordinating the fire protection inspection program. During the meeting, Taylor provided his perspectives on the inspection process and responded to a list of Group questions and concerns provided to him before the meeting. A summary of his comments and responses are set forth below:

A. General Comments

At the outset, Taylor stated that I&E inspections were to be conducted through the regions with centralized control from headquarters in Bethesda. Two "national" fire protection inspection teams will conduct all inspections. Each team will consist of one lead inspector from the region (generally a systems engineer), two to three reactor system specialists (electrical, mechanical, or I&C engineers), one fire protection specialist, and perhaps representatives from the NRR and I&E headquarters staffs. Consultants will form the backbone of each team and will, in all likelihood, come from Brookhaven.

A lead Staff member responsible for fire protection inspections will be appointed for each region. At headquarters, the individual responsible for coordinating the fire protection inspection program will be Leon Whitney.

The I&E inspection process will initially focus on operating reactors and later (perhaps several years) on NTOLs who have obtained operating licenses. During the inspection, the principal focus will be on equipment required to achieve and maintain hot shutdown.

Inspections will be conducted using an audit format. I&E is aware that NRR has not reviewed those areas which the licensees have identified as in compliance with Appendix R. Thus, during the inspections, I&E will be particularly concerned with whether those areas meet Appendix R. During the inspection a selected sampling of areas and functions to protect safe shutdown will be audited to assure that adequate protection in the event of fire is present. Taylor expressed the perspective that if it is determined that there is a fire which "can come close" to destroying hot shutdown capabilities, "the plant will not continue to operate."

With regard to the actual inspection process, Taylor stated that all inspections would be scheduled and announced in advance. Further, scheduling would be arranged to assure the minimum disruption of plant activities. Thus, if the inspection is preliminarily scheduled during a time when the plant will be in an outage mode, the licensee should contact I&E as soon as possible to attempt to change the schedule. An inspection cycle will consist of 2-3 weeks preparation time for the team, 1-1 1/2 weeks on site, and 1-1 1/2 weeks for report preparation. During the three-week preparation period, I&E may request additional information from utilities. Thus, I&E will request that a key individual (with operation/systems background

who is knowledgeable regarding the bases of the systems analysis) be designated by the licensee as the contact point to facilitate communications and resolution. The final inspection report will be issued from the region with final resolution of disputes being handled at headquarters.

Taylor stated that he only wanted to go through the inspection process once per plant. In this regard, he stated that if a licensee had exemption requests which had been granted, I&E would not second-guess the technical judgment of NRR. I&E may, however, verify that no misrepresentations of facts were made that would have affected NRR conclusions. For those areas which the licensee stated are in compliance, I&E will audit the analysis performed to determine compliance.

#### B. Specific Questions and Responses

- Q1. Does the I&E inspection modules have any direct applicability to NTOLs? (The titles of the modules state that they are applicable to plants licensed before January 1, 1979. NTOLs do not fall into this category, and further, NTOLs have not received all correspondence referenced in the modules.)
- A1. The focus of the inspection modules is on operating reactors and not NTOLs. Inspection modules for NTOLs will be developed at a later date and will be different than the current inspection modules. However, the regions will conduct some inspections of NTOLs and may use the current modules as the basis for their inspections.
- Q2. The inspections modules make reference to internal I&E procedures. Are such procedures available?
- A2. All I&E procedures referenced in the modules should be available in the NRC Public Document Room.
- Q3. What is the scheduled sequence for conducting the I&E inspections? Include in the answer the basis for scheduling utilities.

- A3. Scheduling will be performed by headquarters in Bethesda. Each year it is anticipated that approximately 20 inspections will be conducted. The first inspection should be held within the next 2-3 months.

With regard to scheduling, Taylor concurred with the Group's perspective that scheduling should be performed in the following priority order:

- (1) First, licensees which have stated that they are in total compliance with Appendix R.
  - (2) Second, licensees which have stated that they are in total compliance with Appendix R except for certain exemption requests requiring modifications which have already been completed.
  - (3) Third, licensees which have modifications yet to be completed in areas other than the alternative shutdown system.
  - (4) Last, other licensees.
- Q4. Will the inspection modules be modified to reflect new Staff positions on the generic issues as discussed during the March 1, 1983 meeting between the Group and representatives from NRR?
- A4. Yes. I&E is following the progress of resolution of the generic issues and will modify the modules, and/or inspection procedures to reflect such generic resolution. For example, modifications will include the generic resolution achieved on the fire barrier issue referenced in, as an example, Section 41, paragraph b of the I&E module regarding safe shutdown requirements.
- Q5. The inspection module regarding safe shutdown requirements of Appendix R (at Section 42, paragraph a.1) states that the reviewer should verify functional requirements regarding reactivity control which appear to be applicable to PWRs but not BWRs. For boiling water reactors, the Auxiliary Systems Branch ("ASB") does not

require that reactivity control functions be capable of monitoring reactivity conditions. Would you please comment on this.

- A5. I&E agrees with the perspectives stated in this comment.
- Q6. In the inspection module regarding safe shutdown requirements of Appendix R (at Section 41, paragraph d), it states that the inspections will verify that "redundant trains of cables and equipment in selected fire areas have been identified and analyzed by the licensee . . . ." What is the verification process to be utilized?
- A6. On an audit basis, I&E will review analyses of the licensee to determine if fire areas have been identified and analyzed appropriately. This process is what is meant by verification.
- Q7. In the module on safe shutdown requirements for Appendix R (at Appendix 3), it notes that licensees will be given credit for certain activities. Please explain the process to be used in giving such credit.
- A7. Credit will be given for inspections previously conducted by I&E in accordance with the other I&E modules referenced in Appendix 3.
- Q8. The following comments relate to Appendix 1 of the module on safe shutdown requirements for Appendix R:

a. Section A.2.d

Too much emphasis is to be placed on the routing and tracing of control circuits. In many instances, licensees, with the concurrence of ASB, are taking manual control of pumps at switchgear or motor control centers. Alternatively, isolation devices and transfer switches are used to provide isolation from potentially damaged control circuits. Also, recognition of the use of manual operation of valves, recognized by ASB, should be embodied in the general guidance given here.

- Aa. I&E will accept the ASB perspectives on this issue.

b. Section A.3.c

Few, if any, of the operating plants will have run specific tests of the type indicated here. It is not clear what significance the absence of this type of information will have on the I&E inspection.



- A10. The procedures need to be in place by the implementation date set forth in the §50.48, or in any scheduler exemption granted.
- Q11. With regard to procedures, will I&E require the licensee to walk through the procedures and show that they may be accomplished?
- A11. I&E will closely review all procedures which appear to be unreasonable. However, even with procedures that are reasonable, I&E may request that the licensee walk through the procedure to show that it indeed can be accomplished with existing manpower in a reasonable time. However, in requiring licensees to demonstrate the practicability of procedures, I&E will not make unreasonable, unrealistic assumptions.
- Q12. Could you please state your perspectives on the deficiencies which were found at D.C. Cook, and how they may relate to inspections to be conducted in the future.
- A12. At Cook the licensee was clearly not prepared for the inspection. The licensee had stated that initially it was in compliance with Appendix R. However, immediately before the inspection was conducted it attempted to retract this statement. In the inspection I&E found that there were significant flaws in the fire protection features of the plant. For example, the procedures were not realistic and had not been checked through the operations staff to determine if they could be accomplished. In addition there were fundamental errors in the procedures. In this regard all procedures and actions taken in response to Appendix R requirements, including those necessary to achieve cold shutdown, must have a §50.59 evaluation conducted to assure that they do not raise unreviewed safety questions.

## II. GROUP COMMENTS REGARDING DISCUSSIONS WITH THE I&E STAFF

It was the general perception of the Group that Taylor appeared to be evenhanded in his dealings with the issues, and would provide a balanced approach in this area.

A great deal of discussion was generated regarding the schedule for inspections. Taylor had stated that if any licensee wanted to be one of the first plants to be inspected, he would welcome volunteers. It was the perspective of the Group that, in all likelihood, the initial plants inspected would receive an easier inspection than those inspected at a later date; the more inspections that are conducted the more proficient the inspection teams become. If any member of the Group would care to volunteer to be one of the first to be inspected, and believes it is ready to be inspected, please contact us and we will get in touch with Taylor to try to work out the details.

In addition, it was determined that the Group should attempt to obtain the inspection schedule, and arrange for representatives from the Group to be present during the earlier inspections. Thus, the Group can be kept informed of significant items of interest to the inspection teams. In addition, it was determined that the Group would act as a clearinghouse for dissemination of information from licensees who had been inspected.

### III. DISCUSSION OF GENERIC ITEM RESOLUTION PROCESS

The results of the March 1, 1983 meeting with the NRC Staff regarding resolution of generic issues was discussed. The discussion centered on our March 10, 1983 memorandum to the Group which outlined the results of this meeting. EPM reported that they are encountering some difficulty in attempting to develop specific criteria for determining whether a partial suppression system is adequate. However, EPM is continuing its efforts.

With regard to the generic resolution items, it is the Group's objectives to obtain from the Staff a clarification letter which will protect licensees in the pending I&E inspections. The clarification letter would request that all licensees examine their plants to determine if, based on the clarifications, any problems exist. If problems exist, licensees will be requested to take appropriate action (e.g., file exemption requests) within a reasonable period of time. Further, the clarification letter should also state that schedular exemption requests should be filed and will be considered on a case-by-case basis, implying that, in all likelihood, due to the ambiguities in the regulations such schedular exemption requests would be granted.

IV. GENERAL DISCUSSION OF  
EXEMPTION APPEAL PROCESS

We reported on the results of several working level meetings which had taken place during the week of February 28, 1983, during which successful resolution had been achieved on all outstanding issues. As reported in previous memoranda, it appears the Staff is now willing to address outstanding exemption requests in a reasonable fashion and, upon an appropriate technical showing, arrive at a reasonable decision. However, one Group member reported on the results of a working level meeting held during the following week (March 7, 1983) during which the licensees failed to achieve resolution.

In general, the perspectives shared by most Group members were optimistic. Group members felt that if an appropriate technical showing was made, the Staff would be reasonable in reaching resolution on the outstanding exemption requests.

In a previous memorandum to the Group, we had reported that we would prepare a memorandum addressing the deficiencies in the Staff exemption review process for possible use in appeal meetings should the current exemption request resolution process become unworkable. While we have completed this task, the process has not reached a point where it would be necessary to use. However, if any Group member would like to obtain a copy, please give us a call.