Docket No. 50-244 LS05-83-09-042

> Mr. John E. Maier, Vice President Electric and Steam Production Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation 89 East Avenue Rochester, New York 14649

Dear Mr. Maier:

SUBJECT: NUREG-0737, ITEM II.B.1, REACTOR COOLANT SYSTEM VENTS

R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant

By letters cited in References 1 through 5 of the enclosure, Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation (RG&E) has provided information and details relating to the design of the reactor Coolant System Vents (RCSV) for Ginna. However, the implementation, schedule and requirement for a pre-implementation review have been superseded by the requirements of 10 CFR 50.44(c)(3)(iii). All operating reactors, in order to provide the improved operational capability required by the rule, must have the RCS vents installed, operational, procedures established and personnel trained in accordance with the schedule provided in the rule. An exemption is necessary if the specific design or schedular requirements of 10 CFR 50.44(c)(3)(ii) cannot be met.

The guidance in NUREG-0737, Item II.B.1, provides an acceptable means of meeting the design requirements of the rule for the RCS vents. Prior to promulgation of the rule, we had reviewed your responses identified above. The enclosed Safety Evaluation (SE, Enclosure 1) is based on the Technical Evaluation Report (TER, Enclosure 2) prepared by our consultant, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and additional items which were outside the scope of the TER. The TER is attached to the SE. You will note our evaluation identifies specific items which are being addressed in conjunction with other ongoing NRC actions and areas where deficiencies may exist or confirmation is necessary to assure conformance with the rule.

We are providing the results of our review for your information. In addition, we have provided the information to NRC Region I to assist them, as they deem appropriate, in determining your compliance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.44(c)(3)(iii). If you have any questions relating to the enclosed SE, please contact the NRC Project Manager.

SEOI OT

8309290349 830928 PDR ADOCK 05000244 PDR PDR

Mr. John E. Maier

We consider NUREG-0737, Item II.B.1, actions to be completed based on the requirements and promulgation of 10 CFR 50.44(c)(3)(iii).

Sincerely,

Original signed by

Dennis M. Crutchfield, Chief Operating Reactors Branch #5 Division of Licensing

Enclosure: Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

DISTRIBUTION

Docket
NRC PDR
Local PDR
NSIC
ORB #5 Reading
DCrutchfield
HSmith
GDick
OELD
ELJordan
JMTaylor
ACRS (10)
DMcDonald
KEccleston
CPatel

DL: ORB #5 HSmith:cc

DIJ: 488 #5 GIJ 0k 2 9 /27 /83

DL: 1090/45 DCrutchfield 9/12/83



cc Harry H. Voigt, Esquire LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby and MacRae 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N. W. Suite 1100 Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. Michael Slade 12 Trailwood Circle Rochester, New York 14618

Ezra Bialik Assistant Attorney General Environmental Protection Bureau New York State Department of Law 2 World Trade Center New York, New York 10047

Resident Inspector
R. E. Ginna Plant
c/o U. S. NRC
1503 Lake Road
Ontario, New York 14519

Stanley B. Klimberg, Esquire General Counsel New York State Energy Office Agency Building 2 Empire State Plaza Albany, New York 12223

Dr. Emmeth A. Luebke
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dr. Richard F. Cole Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D. C. 20555

Dr. Thomas E. Murley,
Regional Administrator
Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region I
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Region II Office ATTN: Regional Radiation Representative 26 Federal Plaza New York, New York 10007

Herbert Grossman, Esq., Chairman Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D. C. 20555

Supervisor of the Town of Ontario 107 Ridge Road West Ontario, New York 14519

Jay Dunkleberger
New York State Energy Office
Agency Building 2
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION

R. E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

DOCKET NO. 50-244

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The requirement for RCS vessel head and high point vents is stated in 10 CFR 50.44 paragraph (c)(3)(iii). Guidance is provided in NUREG-0737 "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements," November 1980, Item II.B.1 Reactor Coolant System Vents and NUREG-0800 "Standard Review Plan," July 1981, Section 5.4.12 Reactor Coolant System High Point Vents. The requirements of 10 CFR 50.44 for RCS high point vents specifically provide that the vent system shall: (1) be designed to ensure low probability of inadvertent or irreversible actuation and a high probability of operating when needed, (2) be remotely operable from the control room, (3) not aggravate the challenge to containment or the course of the accident, and (4) meet the requirements of Appendix A and B of 10 CFR 50.

The licensee has responded to the above requirements in References 1 through 5. These responses have been evaluated by Lawrence Livermore Laboratory under contract to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). The results of this evaluation are presented in the enclosure entitled "Reactor Coolant Systems Vents (NUREG-0737, Item II.B.1), Final Technical Evaluation Report for Ginna." The NRC staff review is based upon the Technical Evaluation Report (TER) and has been extended to items outside the scope of the TER, as specifically identified herein.

Certain items identified below may be subject to confirmation including a post-implementation review and audit to ensure compliance with 10 CFR 50.44(c)(3)(iii).

2.0 EVALUATION

The staff concurs with the TER recommendation that the Ginna vent system design is acceptable provided the following items are satisfactorily resolved:

NUREG-0737 Item II.B.1 Clarification A (12) concerning human factor analysis requires consideration of the addition of vent system controls to the control room. Although this was discussed in the TER, the human factor analysis of control room modifications will be further addressed on an audit basis as part of the review of TMI Item I.D.1 "Control Room Design Review."

.

The second secon

The current design does not provide for continuous valve position indications in the control room per the requirement of NUREG-0737, Item II.B.1, subitem A(5) and subitem (6) concerning the requirement for operability of the vent system from the control room. An acceptable resolution would be for the licensee to restore continuous control power supply to the RCS vent system by deleting its commitment to open the control power breakers and/or remove the related fuses during normal operation. The staff has determined that the related requirements in 10 CFR 50.44(c)(3)(iii) for the inadvertent or irreversible actuation of a vent have been adequately met by the switching systems proposed for the individual valves on the vent system, therefore removal of power is not necessary. The licensee is required to take the necessary action to meet these requirements. This item must be confirmed by the licensee.

The following items are identified in the TER as being outside the scope of the contractor's review: seismic and environmental qualification, operating guidelines and procedures, technical specifications, and the inservice inspection program. The resolution of these items is as follows:

<u>Seismic and Environmental Qualification</u>: Seismic and environmental qualification will be audited in conjunction with generic audits of the licensee's Seismic and Environmental Qualification program.

Operating Guidelines and Procedures: NUREG-0737 Item II.B.1 requested procedures and analyses for operator use of the vents including the identification of the information available to the operator for initiating or terminating vent usage. The staff review of NUREG-0737 Item I.C.1 includes vent operating guidelines as an integral part of emergency operating guidelines. It is our judgement that the owners group emergency operating guidelines as approved by the staff will provide an acceptable basis for the development of plant specific operating procedures. The staff considers this approach a satisfactory resolution of operating procedures for RCS vents.

Technical Specifications: It is currently proposed to issue a generic letter to all licensees regarding the submittal of Proposed Technical Specifications for a number of NUREG-0737 Items, including Item II.B.1, which were required to be implemented after December 31, 1981. Technical Specification requirements for the RCS vents will be included in this forthcoming licensing action.

The state of the s

There is the state of the state

Inservice Inspection Program: The vent system is an extension of the reactor coolant pressure boundary and must meet applicable inservice inspection requirements described by 10 CFR 50.55(g). The staff requires that the licensee include the RCS vent system in the inservice inspection program which is subject to NRC review and audit.

3.0 CONCLUSION

The staff Safety Evaluation is based on a review of the Technical Evaluation Report (TER) performed by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (attached), and the staff reviews of additional items outside the scope of the TER. The staff finds that the vent system at Ginna is acceptable and in conformance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.44 paragraph (c)(3)(iii) and the guidelines of NUREG-0737 Item II.B.1, and NUREG-0800 section 5.4.12. Certain items are subject to confirmation including post implementation NRC audit in conjunction with other ongoing actions/programs. These items are: (1) human factors analysis of control room modifications, (2) confirm restoration of continuous positive valve position indication within, and operability of the Reactor Vessel Head Vent System (RVHVS) vents from the control room during normal operation, indication(3) seismic and environmental qualification, (4) oprating procedures, and (5) the inservice inspection program.

Technical Specifications will be the subject of a separate future licensing action.

4.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This Safety Evaluation has been prepared by D. McDonald and G. Dick.

Date: September 28, 1983

Attachment:

Technical Evaluation Report by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

i

er i

6.0 REFERENCES

- 1. Letter, L.D. White, Jr. (RG&E) to D.L. Ziemann (NRC), "Followup Actions Resulting from the NRC staff Reviews Regarding the Three Mile Island Unit 2 Accident, R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, Docket No. 50-244," dated October 17, 1979.
- 2. Letter, L.D. White, Jr. (RG&E) to D.L. Ziemann (NRC), "Three Mile Island Lessons Learned Short Term Requirements, R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, Docket No. 50-244," dated December 28, 1979.
- 3. Letter, L.D. White, Jr. (RG&E) to D.M. Crutchfield (NRC), "Short Term Lessons Learned, Reactor Coolant System Venting, R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, Docket No. 50-244," dated June 2, 1980.
- 4. Letter, L.D. White, Jr. (RG&E) to D.M. Crutchfield (NRC), "NUREG-0737 Requirements, R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, Docket No. 50-244," dated July 1, 1981.
- 5. Letter, J.E. Maier (RG&E) to D.M. Crutchfield (NRC), "Reactor Coolant System Vents (TMI Item II.B.1), R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, Docket No. 50-244," dated May 7, 1982.