



Commonwealth Edison  
1400 Opus Place  
Downers Grove, Illinois 60515

April 14, 1994

Mr. William Russell, Director  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555

Attn: Document Control Desk

Braidwood Nuclear Power Station Units 1 and 2  
Byron Nuclear Power Station Units 1 and 2  
Dresden Nuclear Power Station Units 2 and 3  
Lasalle Nuclear Power Station Units 1 and 2  
Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station Units 1 and 2  
Zion Nuclear Power Station Units 1 and 2

Commonwealth Edison Company comments pertaining to:  
Maintenance Rule Inspection Guide

NRC Dockets 50-454 and 50-455  
NRC Dockets 50-456 and 50-457  
NRC Dockets 50-237 and 50-249  
NRC Dockets 50-373 and 50-374  
NRC Dockets 50-254 and 50-265  
NRC Dockets 50-295 and 50-304

Commonwealth Edison appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed pertaining to implementation of the Maintenance Rule Inspection Guide.

The following are our comments. Deletions are marked with by strike-through. Additions are in ***bold italics***.

#### GENERAL COMMENTS

Throughout the procedure, there are twelve references to the licensee having established and implemented a **documented** method or process to demonstrate compliance with requirements. Inspection guidance of this nature, requiring documentation, will drive the rule from performance based to audit based, i.e., no change from current regulatory philosophy.

Throughout the procedure, the Statements of Consideration were used as a basis for the inspection guidance with the NUMARC guidance referenced second. Since the NUMARC Guideline is endorsed by Reg. Guide 1.160, its guidance should be the primary reference, with the Statements of Consideration used as backup.

k:dave:mtrule-1

28001

9404290157 940414  
PDR ADDCK 05000237  
PDR

ADD 1/0

Concerns have been expressed with the direction this procedure is taking, i.e., audit based. There is skepticism that the NRC can administrate a performance based rule. It has been suggested that each site should docket their compliance plan to avoid opinion vs. opinion problems with NRC inspectors.

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS

page 1, lines 17 to 20; Inclusion of 50.63 requirements within the scope of this procedure may unnecessarily complicate implementation. For the initial implementation of a different inspection philosophy, the subject matter should be kept as uncomplicated as possible. We recommend that requirements set in 50.63 be eliminated from this procedure.

page 1, line 36; add a footnote reference to "...SSCs<sup>x</sup>..." Also add this corresponding footnote to the bottom of the page, "***As used in this procedure, SSCs can mean 'structures, systems, and components,' or 'structures, systems, or components,' depending on the level determined by the licensee. In all cases, performance criteria, goals, and monitoring should be established at the highest level that adequately demonstrates performance to licensee established goals.***

page 2, line 36; add a footnote reference to "...industry wide operating experience<sup>4</sup>." Also add footnote 4 from page 13 to the bottom of page 2.

page 3, line 22; change to read "The inspector ~~should~~ ***shall*** become..."

page 4, line 30; "~~...goal setting and monitoring contained in the maintenance rule~~ ***measuring performance against licensee established goals.***"

page 4, line 43; add "***...reviews, it appears that the performance or condition of structures, systems, or components is being effectively controlled through the performance of appropriate preventive maintenance, no further inspection activity under the maintenance rule is required. If it appears there may be a need to perform...***"

page 5, lines 40 to 50; a new concept of more and less risk significant is added without definition. The concept appears to be taken out of context from the Reg. Guide. Risk significance should be limited to "Risk Significant" and "Non-risk Significant" as defined in the Industry Guideline.

page 6, line 53 to page 7, line 7; footnote 4 on page 13 provides better guidance than this section. A standard reference or definition of Industry wide Operating Experience should be used throughout this document. All other references should be deleted. "...when establishing goals. ~~Sources of undestroyed operating experience include, but are not limited to, NRC bulletins and information notices, the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO) Nuclear plant reliability data system (NPRDS), vendor technical information letters (TILs), and vendor service information letters (SILs).~~"

page 7, lines 9 to 11; "The inspector should *review the licensees' evaluation of industry operating experience and verify that it appears to be reasonable.* ~~verify that the licensee has established and implemented a documented method or process for considering industry operating experience, where practical, when establishing goals.~~"

page 7, line 28; "...actions *should be reviewed and verified that they appear to be reasonable.* ~~must be documented by the licensee.~~"

page 8, line 4; add "...SSC. *However, there may be some non-risk significant SSCs whose performance cannot be practically monitored by plant-level criteria. Should this occur, other performance criteria should be established, as appropriate (e.g., repetitions of safety function failures attributable to the same maintenance cause).*"

page 8, line 10; add a footnote to define MPFF in terms used in the Industry Guideline.

page 8, lines 19 to 20; "The SOC (Ref. 4) states that it is expected that where one<sup>X</sup> or more maintenance..."

page 8, footnote; Add a footnote "<sup>X</sup>*Section 9.4.4 of NUMARC 93-01 (Ref.2) states that the SSC would not have to be dispositioned to paragraph (a)(1) until a second, repetitive, MPFF occurred.*"

page 9, lines 32 to 37; Based on physical attributes, SSCs are inherently reliable or they are not. Whether or not activities such as inspections, surveys and walkdowns are performed should have no bearing on inherent reliability. Delete the following: "~~However, it should be noted that such activities as inspections, surveys, and walkdowns could be considered maintenance activities and, therefore, most SSCs would be subject to some maintenance. Therefore, the concept of identifying inherently reliable SSCs as those that require no maintenance may be of limited usefulness.~~"

page 9, line 38; "...usefulness. ***The inspector should review the licensee's determination*** ~~Licensees should document their reasons for concluding that certain SSCs are inherently reliable~~ ***and verify that those determinations appear to be reasonable.***"

page 9, line 40; "The inspector should review ~~the documentation~~ for a sample of SSCs that..."

page 9, line 53; "...run to failure. ***The inspector should review the licensee's*** ~~Licensees should document these criteria and their reasons for deciding that individual SSCs could be allowed to run to failure~~ ***and verifying that they appear to be reasonable.***"

page 10, lines 47 to 50; "~~Sources of industry...service information letters (SILs).~~"

page 10, lines 52 to 54; "The inspector should ***review the licensee's*** ~~verify that the licensee has established and implemented a documented method or process for considering industry operating experience when performing evaluations~~ ***and verify that method or process appears to be reasonable.***"

page 11, line 47; "...and implemented an ongoing, ~~documented~~ process for assessing the..."

page 12, lines 16 to 18; The concept of performance base is lost with this guidance, if, prior to any performance initiated actions, the inspector is to independently verify that the SSCs were properly scoped.

page 13, line 10; There is no requirement in any of the guidance to document SSCs that have been excluded from the scope of the rule. Line 10 should be changed to read, "...and verify that the licensee's ***criteria*** ~~documented reasons~~ for..."

page 13, line 41; add: ***However, it is not intended that the inspectors attempt to determine hypothetical failures that could result from system interdependencies that have not previously been experienced or analyzed.***"

page 15, lines 8 to 13; "~~The licensee shall also develop a list of all those SSCs selected for inclusion within the scope of the rule. This list could take the form of either a manual list or an electronic database. In either case, Licensees must have a process to periodically~~ ***review and revise the SSCs included***"

Mr. William Russell

(5)

April 14, 1994

*within the scope of the rule* ~~the list~~ as modifications or other..." Section 13.2 of the NUMARC guideline does not require a separate list of all SSCs within the scope of the rule. Development of such a list would be a costly addition to the implementation of the rule and it would add no value.

page 15, lines 17 to 19; Delete this section.

Again, Commonwealth Edison appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed Generic Letter. Please address any questions pertaining to these comments to me at (708) 663-7292.

Sincerely,



Martin J. Vonk  
Generic Issues Administrator  
Nuclear Regulatory Services

cc: J. Martin, Regional Administrator, NRC Region III  
J. Dyer, Director of Directorate III-2, NRR  
G. Dick, Generic Issues Project Manager, NRR