

Regulatory Guide Periodic Review

Regulatory Guide Number: 1.72 Rev. 2

Title: Spray Pond Piping Made From Fiberglass-Reinforced
Thermosetting Resin

Office/division/branch: RES/DE/CIB

Technical Lead: Eric Focht

Staff Action: **Reviewed with Issues Identified for Future Consideration**

(1) What are the known technical or regulatory issues with the current version of the Regulatory Guide (RG)?

The staff's review of RG 1.72 Rev. 2 identified the following issues:

Section B references ASTM D-2992, "Standard Method for Obtaining Hydrostatic Design Basis for Reinforced Thermosetting Resin Pipe and Fittings Procedures." This is a dynamic reference and, thus, the implication is that the current version of the standard may be used, but the current version has a different title. A preliminary review of the latest version showed that it was applicable to RG 1.72, Rev. 2.

Section B references RG 1.48 for general guidance regarding loading combinations relative to design limits for Class 3 piping, but RG 1.48 has since been withdrawn and now the guidance is provided in NUREG-0800 Standard Review Plan (SRP) Section 3.9.3. A preliminary review of the latest version of SRP 3.9.3 showed that it was applicable to RG 1.72, Rev. 2.

(2) What is the impact on internal and external stakeholders of not updating the RG for the known issues, in terms of anticipated numbers of licensing and inspection activities over the next several years?

No impact on internal or external stakeholders was identified during the review of RG 1.72, Rev. 2 since there are no known upcoming licensing or inspections activities that would involve using it.

(3) What is an estimate of the level of effort needed to address identified issues in terms of Full-Time (FTE) Equivalent and contract dollars?

An effort undertaken to update RG 1.72, Rev. 2 requires an estimated 0.12 FTE (i.e. six weeks) of staff time. No contract dollars are required.

(4) Based on the answers to the questions above, what is the staff action for this RG (Revise, Reviewed, Administrative Change, or Withdraw)?

The action for this RG is to consider it “Reviewed with issues identified for future consideration” (see #1) because it references out-of-date standards, but there are no known upcoming licensing or inspection activities requiring its use that justify revising it immediately.

(5) Provide a conceptual plan and timeframe to address the issues identified during the review.

If a licensing need arises, if sufficient industry interest is expressed, or if the Commission directs the staff to prepare for related activities, then the staff will consider revising the RG.

NOTE: This review was conducted in December 2014 and reflects the staff’s plans as of that date. These plans are tentative and are subject to change.