



Docket No. 50-261

Mr. J. A. Jones Senior Vice President Capolina Power and Light Company 336 Fayetteville Street Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Dear Mr. Jones:

By letter from D. G. Eisenhut dated October 31, 1980 we transmitted to you a copy of NUREG-0737 "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements." Item II.F.1.1 in this document provides criteria for monitoring concentrations of noble gas fission products in plant gaseous effluents during and following an accident. The requirements of this item are to be implemented by January 1, 1982.

In your response dated March 3, 1981, you provided design details for a system to monitor noble gas effluents that would be installed by January 1, 1982. This system deviated from the requirements of NUREG-0737 in two ways. You proposed to calibrate the effluent monitor to the average energy of the TID-14844 source term instead of to a Xe-133 equivalent. You also proposed to use radiation detectors mounted externally to the stack.

Our preliminary evaluation of your system was provided to your staff on August 12, 1981. We found the use of an alternate cadibration source to be acceptable as long as energies between 60 KeV and 3 MeV can be measured. We found, however, that the design of an externally mounted detector did not meet two requirements of NUREG-0737. This deviation has been discussed several times between our staffs and in my letter to you dated September 30, 1981 but has not been resolved.

We have submitted your proposal to a staff contractor for additional review, and I am enclosing the contractor's evaluation. As you will see, this evaluation concludes that your proposed design is not sufficient to meet the requirements of Table II.F.1-1 of NUREG-0737 for the upper ranges of noble gas effluents, e.g., 10² to 10⁵ uCi/cc/. Similarly, a radiation detector mounted internally to the duct, but not shielded from ambient radiation, is not sufficient to meet the requirements for concentrations less than 10² uCi/cc, unless the detector is responsive only to beta radiation, e.g. beta scintillation detector.

The Technical Evaluation considers the merits of offline detectors. The deviation for the high range detector can also be resolved by a procedure through which the thickness of the duct of pipe may be taken into account when measuring how-energy gamma radiation; however, such a procedure must satisfactorily consider the shifting energy spectrum resulting from radio-active decay following reactor shutdown.

We desire to resolve this issue expeditiously so as to minimize the slippage of the implementation date. You are requested to provide additional technical justification of your design or a commitment to meet the requirements of Table II.F.1-1 of NUREG-0737 within 15 days of receipt of this letter. A commitment to meet the NUREG-0737 requirements should be accompanied by an implementation schedule for our approval.

Sincerely,

Original signed by: c. A. Warga

Steven A. Varga, Chief Operating Reactors Branch #1 Division of Licensing

Enclosure: Technical Evaluation

cc w/enclosure: See next page

OFFICE	ORB#1:DA	ORB#3:DL	0RB#1.70L)			
- 1	WRoss:05	12/22/81	SVarga			
	(10-80) NRCM 0240		OFFICIAL F	ECORD C	OPY	 USGPO: 1981—335-960

Mr. J. A. Jones Carolina Power and Light Company

cc: G. F. Trowbridge, Esquire Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge 1800 M Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20036

> Hartsville Memorial Library Home and Fifth Avenues Hartsville, South Carolina 29550

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Resident Inspector's Office H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant Route 5, Box 266-1A Hartsville, South Carolina 29550

Michael C. Farrar, Chairman Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board Panel U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D. C. 20555

Richard S. Salzman
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Appeal Board Panel
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dr. W. Reed Johnson
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Appeal Board Panel
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555