

Dockets

OCT 9 1979

Docket No: 50-410

Mr. Gerald K. Rhode, Vice President
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation
300 Erie Boulevard West
Syracuse, New York 13202

SUBJECT: MARK II POOL DYNAMIC LOADS PROGRAM - NINE MILE POINT
-NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 2

Dear Mr. Rhode:

The Mark II lead plant program is essentially complete, and we are now planning our review of the closure program for the Mark II pool dynamic loads. A growing tendency of applicants to depend on plant-unique programs, rather than generic programs, during the past year makes it necessary for us to request definition of the pool dynamic loads programs being relied on by each Mark II owner, especially that part which falls outside the scope of the generic Mark II pool dynamic loads program.

We have believed for some time that joint efforts toward resolution of issues on a generic basis results in substantial cost and schedule savings to the NRC, the industry, and thus to the public. We stated this view in April 1976 during the early stages of our review of the Mark II program, and again in September 1978 when the Mark II lead plant acceptance criteria were issued. On July 24, 1979 the staff met with the Mark II owners to discuss the closure efforts associated with the Mark II Long Term Program. At this meeting, the Mark II owners stated that the generic programs associated with SRV and LOCA pool dynamic loads would be completed in 1979 and 1980, respectively. However, the Mark II owners identified a number of plants requesting relief from the generic pool dynamic loads specifications. This resulted in a comparable number of new plant-unique programs. Little information has been provided to the NRC defining these new plant-unique pool dynamic programs.

Considering the design differences between Mark II plants, and the various licensing schedules for plants, we see a limited need for reliance on plant-unique pool dynamic load programs. The limitations on staff technical resources, however, make it possible for us to complete

may

OFFICE									
SURNAME									
DATE									

7910230/1/2

14

52

Mr. Gerald K. Rhode

- 2 -

OCT 9 1979

our licensing activities for these plants in a timely manner only if the Mark II owners pursue a generic approach to resolution of pool dynamic load issues to the maximum extent practicable. For those areas where a completely generic approach is not acceptable, we encourage use of semi-generic approaches, as in the case of the lead plant owners and the KTG "T" quencher. Another possible sub-grouping would be to combine analyses for plants with a common architect engineer.

We ask that you provide a description of those pool dynamic load tasks, outside the generic Mark II pool dynamic loads program, that are a part of your pool dynamic loads definition program. Your response should include the following information:

- task description
- rationale for plant unique program
- task schedule
- documentation (contents and schedule).

This information should be provided to us by November 15, 1979, so that we can plan our review efforts. We anticipate a meeting to discuss these items at an early date following the submittal of the letters. The purpose of this meeting would be to determine the extent to which a generic or semi-generic approach has been pursued, and to obtain information needed by us to establish priorities for the review of the various plants. Until that time, we will continue to review the pool dynamic load program on a primarily generic basis. We intend to review non-generic pool dynamic load programs on the basis of available NRC resources, with review priorities for these programs established by the licensing schedule for each facility.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:
S. A. Varga

S. A. Varga, Acting Assistant Director
for Light Water Reactors
Division of Project Management

cc: See next page

OFFICE>	DPM: LWR-4	DPM: LWR-4	DPM: LWR-4	DPM: AD/LWR	
SURNAME>	MSerice	DLynch	LRKenstein	SAVarga	
DATE>	10/4/79	10/04/79	10/5/79	10/09/79	





UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

Docket No: 50-410

OCT 9 1979

Mr. Gerald K. Rhode, Vice President
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation
300 Erie Boulevard West
Syracuse, New York 13202

SUBJECT: MARK II POOL DYNAMIC LOADS PROGRAM - NINE MILE POINT
NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 2

Dear Mr. Rhode:

The Mark II lead plant program is essentially complete, and we are now planning our review of the closure program for the Mark II pool dynamic loads. A growing tendency of applicants to depend on plant-unique programs, rather than generic programs, during the past year makes it necessary for us to request definition of the pool dynamic loads programs being relied on by each Mark II owner, especially that part which falls outside the scope of the generic Mark II pool dynamic loads program.

We have believed for some time that joint efforts toward resolution of issues on a generic basis results in substantial cost and schedule savings to the NRC, the industry, and thus to the public. We stated this view in April 1976 during the early stages of our review of the Mark II program, and again in September 1978 when the Mark II lead plant acceptance criteria were issued. On July 24, 1979 the staff met with the Mark II owners to discuss the closure efforts associated with the Mark II Long Term Program. At this meeting, the Mark II owners stated that the generic programs associated with SRV and LOCA pool dynamic loads would be completed in 1979 and 1980, respectively. However, the Mark II owners identified a number of plants requesting relief from the generic pool dynamic loads specifications. This resulted in a comparable number of new plant-unique programs. Little information has been provided to the NRC defining these new plant-unique pool dynamic programs.

Considering the design differences between Mark II plants, and the various licensing schedules for plants, we see a limited need for reliance on plant-unique pool dynamic load programs. The limitations on staff technical resources, however, make it possible for us to complete

OCT 9 1979

our licensing activities for these plants in a timely manner only if the Mark II owners pursue a generic approach to resolution of pool dynamic load issues to the maximum extent practicable. For those areas where a completely generic approach is not acceptable, we encourage use of semi-generic approaches, as in the case of the lead plant owners and the KTG "T" quencher. Another possible sub-grouping would be to combine analyses for plants with a common architect engineer.

We ask that you provide a description of those pool dynamic load tasks, outside the generic Mark II pool dynamic loads program, that are a part of your pool dynamic loads definition program. Your response should include the following information:

- task description
- rationale for plant unique program
- task schedule
- documentation (contents and schedule).

This information should be provided to us by November 15, 1979, so that we can plan our review efforts. We anticipate a meeting to discuss these items at an early date following the submittal of the letters. The purpose of this meeting would be to determine the extent to which a generic or semi-generic approach has been pursued, and to obtain information needed by us to establish priorities for the review of the various plants. Until that time, we will continue to review the pool dynamic load program on a primarily generic basis. We intend to review non-generic pool dynamic load programs on the basis of available NRC resources, with review priorities for these programs established by the licensing schedule for each facility.

Sincerely,



S. A. Varga, Acting Assistant Director
for Light Water Reactors
Division of Project Management

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

NRC PDR
Local PDR
✓ Docket Files
TERA
LWR-4 File
S. Varga
M. Williams
B. Moore
R. Denise, DSS
L. Rubenstein
Project Manager
Licensing Assistant (2)
Attorney, ELD
I&E (3)

bcc: NSIC
TIC
ACRS (16)

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation - -

ccs:

Arvin E. Upton, Esq.
LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae
1757 N Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Anthony Z. Roisman, Esq.
Natural Resources Defense Council
917 15th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

Mr. Richard Goldsmith
Syracuse University
College of Law
E. I. White Hall Campus
Syracuse, New York 13210

T. K. DeBoer, Director
Technological Development Programs
New York State Energy Office
Swan Street Building
Core 1 - 2nd Floor
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

