



BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY  
ASSOCIATED UNIVERSITIES, INC.

Upton, New York 11973

(516) 345- 2362

Department of Nuclear Energy

November 29, 1979

Mr. Robert L. Ferguson  
Plant Systems Branch  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Bob:

In order to assure meeting Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL) dates for design review and supplement inputs, I have done a document review of the following plants for my own inputs:

- |                   |                 |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| 1. H. B. Robinson | 5. Fort Calhoun |
| 2. Pilgrim        | 6. LaCrosse     |
| 3. Ginna          | 7. FitzPatrick  |
| 4. Calvert Cliffs |                 |

↓  
REVIEW 1/23/80  
↓

I found that I need licensee inputs as follows:

1. H. B. Robinson - none missing
2. Pilgrim - Item 3.27 D.C. Power System Hazard Analysis missing information detailed in letter to Jim Knight May 24, 1979. No answer received at BNL to date.
3. Ginna - 3.1.21 - Need details of water curtain for BNL evaluation 3.1.43. Need 5 items to review per Jack Klevan letter of May 25, 1979. No answer received at BNL to date.
- 3.2.4 - Need further cable insulation data per Jack Klevan's letter of May 25, 1979. No answer received at BNL to date. It would be helpful to get the cable manufacturer's name for the cable types submitted.
- 3.2.6 - Combustible liquids in drains. We need details on how they propose to make these changes to the drains.
4. Calvert Cliffs - No submittals received to date. Due November 1979.
5. Fort Calhoun - 3.1.15/3.2.4 - Further information required. See separate letter to R. Ferguson November 29, 1979.

STILL NO ANSWER AT BNL

STILL NO ANSWER AT BNL

STILL NO FURTHER INFORMATION RECEIVED AT BNL

STILL NO ANSWER AT BNL

5 SUBMITTALS

STILL NO ANSWER AT BNL

3.1.15 - CABLE SEPARATION  
3.1.21 ALTERNATE SHUT DOWN CAPABILITY  
(DIESEL DUMP SHUTOFF)

8001300492

To: R.L. Ferguson

-2-

November 29, 1979

NO FURTHER 6. LaCrosse - 3.2.7 - Circuit interaction study was due November 16, 1979  
INFO REC'D not received at BNL to date.  
AT BNL

REC'D AT 1. FitzPatrick - 3.2.1 due November 1979. Not received at BNL to date.  
BNL - 12/26/79

STILL NOT 3.2.11 - Sent by licensee September 5, 1979. Not received at BNL to  
RECEIVED AT date.  
BNL

We will look for timely responses from you so that we can keep our BNL targeted dates for design review and supplement information.

Very truly yours,



Edward A. MacDougall  
Reactor Engineering Analysis

EAM:sd

cc.: R. Cerbone  
R. Hall  
W. Kato  
T. Lee  
V. Panciera

Rolf Jensen & Associates, Inc.

Fire Protection Engineers  
Building Code Consultants



7617 Little River Turnpike  
Annandale, Virginia 22003  
(703) 256-9854

May 25, 1979

JUN 04 1979

Eq. 21 / 6/4/79

Mr. Robert E. Hall  
Thermal Reactor Safety Division  
Department of Nuclear Energy  
Brookhaven National Laboratory  
Upton, NY 11973

cc to  
sev.

SER SUPPLEMENT, GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

Dear Bob:

I have received and reviewed a copy of the April 30, 1979 letter from Rochester Gas and Electric Corp. to the NRC. This letter provides additional information on four items in the SER issued on February 14, 1979.

SER ITEM 3.1.24

This item confirms the licensee's commitment to upgrade piping and duct penetrations of the fire barriers to a fire resistance rating commensurate with the fire hazard on both sides of the barrier. Licensee's April 30 response states that "ASTME - 119 fire test reports for comparable penetrations will be on file to verify seal adequacy." The licensee should provide the NRC staff a copy of the fire test report for review.

STILL  
OPEN

SER ITEM 3.1.25

This item confirms the licensee's commitment to modify the construction joints between the containment and the surrounding buildings to provide fire resistance commensurate with the hazards in the area. The licensee should describe the type and thickness of the flame retardent coating or silicone compound which will be installed for this purpose, and provide for review a copy of the test reports which substantiate the fire resistance rating.

STILL  
OPEN

Mr. Robert E. Hall  
Ginna Nuclear Power Plant

Page 2 - W1212  
May 25, 1979

SER ITEM 3.1.43

This item confirms the licensee commitment to perform a study and/or testing to verify that proper consideration has been given to such factors as ceiling height and configuration, ventilation air flow patterns, location and arrangement of plant equipment and combustibles, etc., in determining the type, number and location of the fire detectors for existing as well as proposed detector systems.

The licensee's letter of April 30, 1979 describes in a very general manner the method proposed by the licensee to fulfill this commitment. Apparently, the licensee will determine approximate detector locations using NFPA 72 E guidelines, and then test the adequacy of those locations with portable smoke detectors and a smoke generator. Adjustments in location or number of detectors will be made on the basis of this test procedure. The following details should be clarified by the licensee:

- o The response characteristics of the portable smoke detectors relative to the permanent smoke detectors. ✓
- o The character of the artificially generated smoke relative to the smoke from a real fire. ✓
- o The ability of the smoke generator to simulate a real fire, in terms of smoke and heat production. ✓
- o The amount of damage which will occur from the time the fire starts until the fire is detected and eventually extinguished inherent in a prescribed time differential. The licensee should explain how the time differential was determined, and if it is the same for all plant areas. ✓
- o The areas in which heat detectors will be installed and the procedures by which adequacy of design in those areas will be verified. ✓



Rolf Jensen & Associates, Inc.

Mr. Robert Hall  
Ginna Nuclear Power Plant

Page 3 - W1212  
May 25, 1979

SER ITEM 3.2.4

This item confirms the licensee's commitment to investigate the fire characteristics, including fire resistance, of the cable insulation used in the plant. The licensee's April 30, 1979 response states, on the basis of various unidentified generic test reports from manufacturers and test laboratories, that "none of the cable insulation produces combustion products of an unusual or significantly hazardous nature." If this is intended to mean that the combustion products of many cable insulations are not a hazard to life, then I disagree. On other hand, toxicology is a complicated branch of medicine, and the products of combustion of cable insulation may not be demonstrably worse, under all fire conditions, than those of other materials. The licensee should be requested to clarify the meaning of it's response.

STILL  
OPEN

The SER referred to a review by the licensee of cable fire characteristics, of which toxicity is only one. Ease of ignition, burning rate, smoke production, ease of extinguishment, and effect on electrical circuit integrity are some of the others. The NRC should request the licensee to describe the consideration given each of these factors in the conduct of the ongoing safe shutdown analysis required by SER ITEM 3.2.1.

STILL  
OPEN

Yours very truly,

  
Jacob B. Klevan, P.E.

*Don't believe this*

*was done*

JBK/jmp

cc: Leo Derderian

CC TIM LEE A.F

1/23/80