

INPUT FOR
SAFETY EVALUATION REPORT
BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION UNIT 1
BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION UNIT 2
BYRON STATION UNITS 1 AND 2
CALLAWAY PLANT UNIT 1
CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION UNITS 1 AND 2
COMANCHE PEAK STEAM ELECTRIC STATION UNITS 1 AND 2
JOSEPH M. FARLEY UNITS 1 AND 2
INDIAN POINT UNIT 2
INDIAN POINT UNIT 3
REACTOR TRIP SYSTEM VENDOR INTERFACE
ITEM 2.1 (PART 2) OF GENERIC LETTER 83-28

F. G. Farmer

Published November 1986

Idaho National Engineering Laboratory
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 Nos. D6001 and D6002

8612230128 XA

ABSTRACT

This EG&G Idaho, Inc. report provides a review of the submittals for some of the Westinghouse (W) nuclear plants for conformance to Generic Letter 83-28, Item 2.1 (Part 2). The report includes the following plants, all Westinghouse, and is in partial fulfillment of the following TAC Nos.:

<u>Plant</u>	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>TAC Number</u>
Beaver Valley Power Station Unit 1	50-344	52818
Beaver Valley Power Station Unit 2 (OL)	50-412	62495
Byron Station Unit 1	50-454	56276
Byron Station Unit 2 (OL)	50-455	N/A
Callaway Plant Unit 1	50-483	55196
Catawba Nuclear Station Unit 1	50-413	57743
Catawba Nuclear Station Unit 2 (OL)	50-414	N/A
Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station Unit 1 (OL)	50-445	N/A
Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station Unit 2 (OL)	50-446	N/A
Joseph M. Farley Unit 1	50-348	52836
Joseph M. Farley Unit 2	50-364	52837
Indian Point Unit 2	50-247	52846
Indian Point Unit 3	50-286	52847

FOREWORD

This report is provided 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 PWR Licensing-A by EG&G Idaho, Inc.

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission funded the work under the authorization, B&R 20-19-19-11-3, FIN Nos. D6001 and D6002.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
FOREWORD	iii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. REVIEW REQUIREMENTS	2
3. GROUP REVIEW RESULTS	3
4. REVIEW RESULTS FOR BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION UNIT 1	4
4.1 Evaluation	4
4.2 Conclusion	4
5. REVIEW RESULTS FOR BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION UNIT 2	5
5.1 Evaluation	5
5.2 Conclusion	5
6. REVIEW RESULTS FOR BYRON STATION UNITS 1 AND 2	6
6.1 Evaluation	6
6.2 Conclusion	6
7. REVIEW RESULTS FOR CALLAWAY PLANT UNIT 1	7
7.1 Evaluation	7
7.2 Conclusion	7
8. REVIEW RESULTS FOR CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION UNITS 1 AND 2	8
8.1 Evaluation	8
8.2 Conclusion	8
9. REVIEW RESULTS FOR COMANCHE PEAK STEAM ELECTRIC STATION UNITS 1 AND 2	9
9.1 Evaluation	9
9.2 Conclusion	9
10. REVIEW RESULTS FOR JOSEPH M. FARLEY UNITS 1 AND 2.....	10
10.1 Evaluation	10

10.2 Conclusion	10
11. REVIEW RESULTS FOR INDIAN POINT UNIT 2	11
11.1 Evaluation	11
11.2 Conclusion	11
12. REVIEW RESULTS FOR INDIAN POINT UNIT 3	12
12.1 Evaluation	12
12.2 Conclusion	12
13. GROUP CONCLUSION	13
14. REFERENCES	14

CONFORMANCE TO GENERIC LETTER 83-28

ITEM 2.1 (PART 2)

BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION UNIT 1

BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION UNIT 2

BYRON STATION UNITS 1 AND 2

CALLAWAY PLANT UNIT 1

CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION UNITS 1 AND 2

COMANCHE PEAK STEAM ELECTRIC STATION UNITS 1 AND 2

JOSEPH M. FARLEY UNITS 1 AND 2

INDIAN POINT UNIT 2

INDIAN POINT UNIT 3

1. INTRODUCTION

On July 8, 1983, Generic Letter 83-28¹ was issued by D. G. Eisenhut, Director of the Division of Licensing, Office of 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."²

This report documents the EG&G Idaho, Inc. review of the submittals of a group of Westinghouse plants including Beaver Valley Units 1 and 2, Byron Units 1 and 2, Callaway Unit 1, Catawba Units 1 and 2, Comanche Peak Units 1 and 2, Farley Units 1 and 2 and Indian Point Units 2 and 3 for conformance to Item 2.1 (Part 2) of Generic Letter 83-28. The submittals from the licensees and applicants utilized in these evaluations are referenced in Section 14 of this report.

2. REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

Item 2.1 (Part 2) (Reactor Trip System - Vendor Interface) requires licensees and applicants to establish, implement and maintain a continuing program to ensure that vendor information on Reactor Trip System (RTS) components is complete, current and controlled throughout the life of the plant, and appropriately referenced or incorporated in plant instructions and procedures. The vendor interface program is to include periodic communications with vendors to assure that all applicable information has been received, as well as a system of positive feedback with vendors for mailings containing technical information, e. g., licensee/applicant acknowledgement for receipt of technical information.

That part of the vendor interface program which ensures that vendor information on RTS components, once acquired, is appropriately controlled, referenced and incorporated in plant instructions and procedures, will be evaluated as part of the review of Item 2.2 of the Generic Letter.

Because the Nuclear Steam System Supplier (NSSS) is ordinarily also the supplier of the entire RTS, the NSSS is also the principal source of information on the components of the RTS. This review of the licensee and applicant submittals will:

1. Confirm that the licensee/applicant has identified an interface with either the NSSS or with the vendors of each of the components of the Reactor Trip System.
2. Confirm that the interface identified by licensees/applicants includes periodic communication with the NSSS or with the vendors of each of the components of the Reactor Trip System.
3. Confirm that the interface identified by licensees/applicants includes a system of positive feedback to confirm receipt of transmittals of technical information.

3. GROUP REVIEW RESULTS

The relevant submittals from each of the included reactor plants were reviewed to determine compliance with Item 2.1 (Part 2). First, the submittals from each plant were reviewed to establish that Item 2.1 (Part 2) was specifically addressed. Second, the submittals were evaluated to determine the extent to which each of the plants complies with the staff guidelines for Item 2.1 (Part 2).

4. REVIEW RESULTS FOR BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION, UNIT 1

4.1 Evaluation

Duquesne Light, the licensee for Beaver Valley 1, provided their response to Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter on November 4, 1983. In that response, the licensee confirms that the NSSS for Beaver Valley 1 is Westinghouse and that the RTS for Beaver Valley 1 is included as a part of the Westinghouse interface program established for the Beaver Valley 1 NSSS.

The Westinghouse interface program for the NSSS includes both periodic communication between Westinghouse and licensees/applicants and positive feedback from licensees/applicants in the form of signed receipts for technical information transmitted by Westinghouse.

4.2 Conclusion

The staff finds the licensee's confirming statement that Beaver Valley 1 is a participant in the Westinghouse interface program for the RTS meets the staff position on Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter and is, therefore, acceptable.

5. REVIEW RESULTS FOR BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION, UNIT 2

5.1 Evaluation

Duquesne Light, the applicant for Beaver Valley 2, provided their response to Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter on March 30, 1984. In that response, the applicant confirms that the NSSS for Beaver Valley 2 is Westinghouse and that the RTS for Beaver Valley 2 is included as a part of the Westinghouse interface program established for the Beaver Valley 2 NSSS.

The Westinghouse interface program for the NSSS includes both periodic communication between Westinghouse and licensees/applicants and positive feedback from licensees/applicants in the form of signed receipts for technical information transmitted by Westinghouse.

5.2 Conclusion

The staff finds the applicant's confirming statement that Beaver Valley 2 is a participant in the Westinghouse interface program for the RTS meets the staff position on Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter and is, therefore, acceptable.

6. REVIEW RESULTS FOR BYRON STATION UNITS 1 AND 2

6.1 Evaluation

Commonwealth Edison, the licensee for Byron 1 and applicant for Byron 2, responded to Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter on May 7, 1985. In that response, the licensee/applicant confirms that the NSSS for Byron is Westinghouse and that the RTS for Byron is included as a part of the Westinghouse interface program established for the Byron 1 and 2 NSSS.

The Westinghouse interface program for the NSSS includes both periodic communication between Westinghouse and licensees/applicants and positive feedback from licensees/applicants in the form of signed receipts for technical information transmitted by Westinghouse.

6.2 Conclusion

The staff finds the licensee's/applicant's confirming statement that Byron is a participant in the Westinghouse interface program for the RTS meets the staff position on Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter and is, therefore, acceptable.

7. REVIEW RESULTS FOR CALLAWAY PLANT UNIT 1

7.1 Evaluation

Union Electric Company, the licensee for Callaway, responded to Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter on November 18, 1983. In that response the licensee confirms that the NSSS for Callaway is Westinghouse and that the RTS for Callaway is included as a part of the Westinghouse interface program established for the Callaway NSSS.

The Westinghouse interface program for the NSSS includes both periodic communication between Westinghouse and licensees/applicants and positive feedback from licensees/applicants in the form of signed receipts for technical information transmitted by Westinghouse.

7.2 Conclusion

The staff finds the licensee's confirming statement that Callaway is a participant in the Westinghouse interface program for the RTS meets the staff position on Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter and is, therefore, acceptable.

8. REVIEW RESULTS FOR CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION UNITS 1 AND 2

8.1 Evaluation

Duke Power Company, the applicant for Catawba Units 1 and 2, responded to Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter on November 4, 1983. In that response, the applicant confirms that the NSSS for Catawba is Westinghouse and that the RTS for Catawba is included as a part of the Westinghouse interface program established for the Catawba NSSS.

The Westinghouse interface program for the NSSS includes both periodic communication between Westinghouse and licensees/applicants and positive feedback from licensees/applicants in the form of signed receipts for technical information transmitted by Westinghouse.

8.2 Conclusion

The staff finds the applicant's confirming statement that Catawba is a participant in the Westinghouse interface program for the RTS meets the staff position on Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter and is, therefore, acceptable.

9. REVIEW RESULTS FOR COMANCHE PEAK STEAM
ELECTRIC STATION UNITS 1 AND 2

9.1 Evaluation

Texas Utilities Generating Company, the applicant for Comanche Peak Units 1 and 2, responded to Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter on November 21, 1983. In that response, the applicant confirms that the NSSS for Comanche Peak is Westinghouse and that the RTS for Comanche Peak is included as a part of the Westinghouse interface program established for the Comanche Peak NSSS.

The Westinghouse interface program for the NSSS includes both periodic communication between Westinghouse and licensees/applicants and positive feedback from licensees/applicants in the form of signed receipts for technical information transmitted by Westinghouse.

5.2 Conclusion

The staff finds the applicant's confirming statement that Comanche Peak is a participant in the Westinghouse interface program for the RTS meets the staff position on Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter and is, therefore, acceptable.

10. REVIEW RESULTS FOR JOSEPH M. FARLEY
NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2

10.1 Evaluation

Alabama Power, the licensee for Farley 1 and 2, provided their response to Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter on November 4, 1983. In that response, the licensee confirms that the NSSS for Farley 1 and 2 is Westinghouse and that the RTS for Farley 1 and 2 is included as a part of the Westinghouse interface program established for the Farley NSSS.

The Westinghouse interface program for the NSSS includes both periodic communication between Westinghouse and licensees/applicants and positive feedback from licensees/applicants in the form of signed receipts for technical information transmitted by Westinghouse.

10.2 Conclusion

The staff finds the licensee's confirming statement that Farley 1 and 2 is a participant in the Westinghouse interface program for the RTS meets the staff position on Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter and is, therefore, acceptable.

11. REVIEW RESULTS FOR INDIAN POINT UNIT 2

11.1 Evaluation

Consolidated Edison Company, the licensee for Indian Point 2, provided their response to Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter on November 4, 1983. In that response, the licensee confirms that the NSSS for Indian Point 2 is Westinghouse and that the RTS for Indian Point 2 is included as a part of the Westinghouse interface program established for the Indian Point 2 NSSS.

The Westinghouse interface program for the NSSS includes both periodic communication between Westinghouse and licensees/applicants and positive feedback from licensees/applicants in the form of signed receipts for technical information transmitted by Westinghouse.

11.2 Conclusion

The staff finds the licensee's confirming statement that Indian Point 2 is a participant in the Westinghouse interface program for the RTS meets the staff position on Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter and is, therefore, acceptable.

12. REVIEW RESULTS FOR INDIAN POINT UNIT 3

12.1 Evaluation

The New York Power Authority, the licensee for Indian Point 3, provided their response to Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter on November 7, 1983. In that response, the licensee confirms that the NSSS for Indian Point 3 is Westinghouse and that the RTS for Indian Point 3 is included as a part of the Westinghouse interface program established for the Indian Point 3 NSSS.

The Westinghouse interface program for the NSSS includes both periodic communication between Westinghouse and licensees/applicants and positive feedback from licensees/applicants in the form of signed receipts for technical information transmitted by Westinghouse.

11.2 Conclusion

The staff finds the licensee's confirming statement that Indian Point 3 is a participant in the Westinghouse interface program for the RTS meets the staff position on Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter and is, therefore, acceptable.

13. GROUP CONCLUSION

The staff concludes that the licensee/applicant responses for the listed Westinghouse plants for Item 4.5.2 of Generic Letter 83-28 are acceptable.

14. 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. Duquesne Light letter to NRC, J. J. Carey to D. G. Eisenhut, Director, Division of Licensing, NRC, "Response to Generic Letter 83-28," November 4, 1983.
4. Duquesne Light letter to NRC, E. J. Woolever to D. G. Eisenhut, Director, Division of Licensing, NRC, "Response to Generic Letter 83-28," March 30, 1984.
5. Commonwealth Edison letter to NRC, G. L. Alexander to Harold R. Denton, Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, May 7, 1985.
6. Union Electric Company letter to NRC, D. F. Schnell to Harold R. Denton, Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, NRC, "Response to Generic Letter 83-28," November 18, 1983.
7. Duke Power Company letter to NRC, H. B. Tucker to D. G. Eisenhut, Director, Division of Licensing, November 4, 1983.
8. Texas Utilities Generating Company letter to NRC, Billy R. Clements to D. G. Eisenhut, Director, Division of Licensing, "Supplement 1 to the CPSES Response to Generic Letter 83-28," November 21, 1983.
9. Alabama Power letter to NRC, F. L. Clayton to Director, Nuclear Reactor Regulation, "Response to Generic Letter 83-28," November 4, 1983.
10. Consolidated Edison Company letter to NRC, John D. O'Toole to D. G. Eisenhut, Director, Division of Licensing, November 4, 1983.
11. New York Power Authority letter to NRC, J. P. Bayne to D. G. Eisenhut, Director, Division of Licensing, "Required Actions Based on Generic Implications of Salem ATWS Events (Generic Letter 83-28, dated July 8, 1983)," November 7, 1983.